

THE Hongkong Weekly Press

AND

China Overland Trade Report.

VOL. LXVI.]

HONGKONG, MONDAY, 28TH OCTOBER, 1907.

No. 17

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Epitome	265
Leading Articles:—	
The U. S. and Others	266
Defective Engineering	266
China	267
Chinese Customs	267
Bad and Business	268
Evidence	268
Party	269
Companies	
Canton Insurance Office, Ltd.	270
North China Insurance Co. Ltd.	270
Evolution of Hongkong	271
Adsett's Pleads for Mercy	272
Appointments	272
The Chinese Festival at Macao	272
House-Boy's Extraordinary Impudence	272
The Swatow Reformer	272
Kulansu (Amoy) Municipal Council	272
Supreme Court	
Trial of Adsett's for Murder	273
A Shanghai Jubilee	281
French Capitalists in Japan	285
Opium Decrees	285
Commercial	286
Shipping	288

BIRTHS.

On October 8th, at Chefoo, the wife of W. A. BARLOW WHEELER, I. M. C., of a daughter.
On October 11th, at Shanghai, the wife of W. B. CLAYTON, of a son.
On October 12th, the wife of A. S. P. WHITE COOPER, Shanghai, of a son, [who died next day].
On October 13th, the wife of F. B. PITCAIRN, of a daughter.
On October 13th, at Shanghai, the wife of H. A. GRAY, of a son.
On October 23rd, at the Government Civil Hospital, the wife of the Rev. J. H. FRANCE, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

On October 12th, at Shanghai, ALFRED HUNT to NELLIE CHATHAM.
On October 14th, at Shanghai, HORACE HANBURY, youngest son of the late Sir Thomas Hanbury, K.C.V.O., of La Morta, Ventimiglia, Italy, to ALEXANDRA BEATRICE KATHLEEN, youngest daughter of the late Sir Frank Souter, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., J.P., Commissioner of Police, Bombay, etc.
On October 16th, at Shanghai, ROBERT BROCK, to HELEN, eldest daughter of Neil C. Brodie, of Shanghai.
On October 17th, at the British Episcopal Church, Foochow, by the Rev. L. Lloyd, JAMES HELBLING, to BARBARA THEODORA JEFFREY, daughter of the late WILLIAM HENRY ABBOTT, Esq., of Kent, England.
On October 18th, at Shanghai, O. H. RITTER, Cashier, Pacific Mail Steamship Co., Shanghai, to Miss LUCY A. CORKER.
On October 19th, at Shanghai, FREDERICK D. BARBETTO to OLIVE H. JONES.

DEATHS.

On October 12th, at Shanghai, LESLIE J. DELLOW, late Sub-Editor of the China Gazette.
On October 16th, at Canton, ALFRED HAYNES, infant son of Mr. and Mrs. H. Haynes, aged 14 months, deeply regretted.
On October 17th, at Shanghai, LEONARD M. D'ALMEIDA, aged 52 years.
On October 19th, at Shanghai, CECIL ERNEST GRAY, infant son of H. A. Gray.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.

Mr. and Mrs. H. HAYNES desire to thank the many friends who have shown sympathy with them in their recent bereavement.

Hongkong Weekly Press.

HONGKONG OFFICE: 10A, DES VŒUX ROAD CL.
LONDON OFFICE: 131, FLEET STREET, E.C.

ARRIVAL OF MAIL.

The s.s. *Tonkin*, with the French Mail of September 27th, and the s.s. *Prinz Ludwig* with the German Mail of 1st October, arrived to-day.

FAR EASTERN NEWS.

The Colony's liabilities on August 31st were \$34,167.50; its assets were \$1,466,623.72. The balance of assets over liabilities is therefore, \$1,432,456.22.

The grounding of H.M.S. *Flora* on the Cust Rocks has drawn the attention of the Authorities to the necessity of a special buoy bearing a special light being moored near these rocks. A buoy is at present being prepared by the Dock Company similar to those which mark the fairways at the western end of the harbour. When this is ready it will be put into position, and will bear a red light.

The Governor of Heilungkiang, H. F. Chong Tschuan, has reported to the Waiwupu that in spite of his repeated demands the Russian officials in his vicinity have refused to give up forty-six villages which lie within the Chinese boundaries, and asks that a protest be made to the Russian Minister in Peking at this violation of territory of a friendly Power. This is where the new treaties seem needed.

It is announced that the British Post Office at Tientsin is to remain open. Representations from the Tientsin community and from elsewhere have resulted in an undertaking on the part of the Hongkong authorities to keep the Post Office open for another year, and by the end of that time it is hoped that a satisfactory arrangement will be arrived at between the three parties concerned, the Hongkong Government, the Imperial Government and the British community at Tientsin.

Among the cargo shipped by the s.s. "Empire" for Australia on Oct 23rd was a large quantity of bran from the Junk Bay Mills. Mr. A. H. Rennie also received same day an extraordinary wire asking for as much wheat as he could ship. The Australian harvest prospects cannot be bright this year when merchants there are seeking wheat from Hongkong, a proceeding which reminds those who know of the vast areas under cultivation in the Island Continent of shipping coals to Newcastle.

The navy and artillery has long been familiar with "the Hongkong target." They now have "the new Hongkong target," the invention of a local Major. It is a light structure consisting of three planes, designed to glide quickly along the surface of the sea. In recent practice the old diagonal course towed across the battery front has been abandoned. Two targets now approach the battery slanting from port and starboard, and almost meeting, quickly diverge, forming a course not unlike the "bottle" figure in skating.

Piracy still continues in the waters of the delta. Several cases have been reported to the Chinese authorities and the local police are not relaxing their inquiries with regard to others which have been reported to them. In the case of the piracy which took place between here and Macao less than a fortnight ago a claim has been made by one man that he is the owner of the junk found by the police at Aberdeen.

Ten Chinese were placed before Mr. C. D. Melbourne at the Police Court on Oct. 19th charged with behaving in a disorderly manner at Yaumati on the previous night. The defendants were part of a gang of natives who gathered outside the Yaumati Police Station when a woman was arrested, and because they were prevented from entering the charge room proceeded to stone the building. A squad of officers immediately charged the lawbreakers, the result being the arrest of ten. His Worship, on the evidence, held the offence proved and fined each of the defendants \$2.

That the smuggling of arms into China continues with unabated vigour is pretty well known. The Hongkong authorities are doing their utmost to stop the practice but as the operations of the smugglers extend over such a large area it is hopeless to expect that smuggling will be altogether prohibited under present conditions. On 25th Oct. at the Police Court a man who called himself a crolis but who refused to disclose his residence was brought before Mr. Hazeland on a charge of being in possession of four revolvers without a permit. He was fined the maximum penalty of \$250.

On October 18th a number of leading Chinese citizens entertained H. E. Wu Ting-fang, Chinese Minister to the United States of America, at a farewell dinner at one of the leading native hotels at Shekton'sui. In the course of the dinner, His Excellency in addressing the gathering pointed out the goal of Chinese diplomacy in her international relations, reminding his hearers of the duties that devolved on all loyal patriots and faithful citizens irrespective of differences in rank or condition. To be open to all that is good and worthy in the influences and opportunities of the new era; to do what is possible to bring and to keep China in line with the more advanced nations; to aid her progress which, from this time onward, should be steady, rational, and secure, is the privilege of all who seek by right means to accomplish the highest well-being of the nation.

A Japanese correspondent calls attention to a novel railway line which has been constructed in Osaka for the purpose of carrying foot-gear. It runs from the entrance to the exit of the Osaka branch of the well-known firm of "Takashimaya," and its purpose is to carry the clogs worn by customers—and presumably the boots or shoes of those who may wear them. At the present time a clearance sale is proceeding at the store and the salesmen are being kept busy all day long. The correspondent says that *geta* and shoes are left at the store in hundreds or thousands, and in order to prevent confusion a railway line has been constructed through a tunnel under the floor, cars running on it one after another carrying the customers' foot-gear to the exit door. The purchases having been made, the customers on leaving the building are presented with their *geta* in good order, no charge being made for "freightage."

THE U.S. AND OTHERS.

(Daily Press, October 19th.)

That President ROOSEVELT should desire the United States Fleet to pay a visit round Cape Horn to the Pacific Ocean; and that a great many people should not wish it to go, is perhaps understandable from some things which have lately appeared without any reference to Japan. As a fact it seems that the fleet, though composed of a large number of the finest ships in the world, is neither in men nor material in a fit state to undertake the voyage, and the "Little American,"—for England has not a monopoly of that political class,—are quite content that it should remain so; and are not in consequence unwilling that its shortcomings should be corrected, as corrected they were bound to be once UNCLE SAM got to know that something was really out of joint in his Fleet, which he has been led to believe is the finest for its size in the world, and on which he has not spared to expend enormous sums of money. That the voyage of the fleet could be in any measure a threat to Japan was an absurdity that could not recommend itself to the sober thoughts of any sensible man, that Japan could in any way be brought to look upon it as such was only a dream of mischief makers. The fact is that President ROOSEVELT found that he could not otherwise give the nation an inkling of the general unpreparedness of the country to undertake any important war, otherwise than by such an object lesson, which the meanest comprehension could understand, of the unreadiness of the boasted fleet to undertake an unwonted cruise. Like all patriotic Americans, President ROOSEVELT has had disagreeable reminders that the other world Powers do not attach as much weight to the opinions of the United States as her status amongst the nations should seem to call for. As an old commander himself, he knows how far short of the ideal are both Army and Fleet, and as a last act before retiring from office he desires to awaken the interest of the country as to its practical weakness, without at the same time pressing on it a policy of bluster. That certain people have not failed to take advantage of the position with the object of involving the States with one or more of her neighbours is now from day to day becoming more evident. For what other object than that of making the States seem ridiculous in the eyes of the world could such a canard be set afloat as that of the EMPEROR OF GERMANY having offered his fleet to protect the Coast facing the Atlantic, while the fleet was round the corner of Cape Horn? The taunt was understood by the PRESIDENT, though seemingly it has failed to reach the understandings of the feeble press of New York. Now we certainly would not look on with complacency at any indignity offered to the United States. Here at least we have a common feeling. Lately we have had to wince more than once or twice at the indignities which a feeble and incapable Government is bringing down upon our heads from all quarters; and we certainly feel none the better pleased to find that our friends, through very similar shortcomings on their sides, should find themselves exposed to similar gibes. Now at the present moment England, France and the United States are posing very much as the advocates of peace, but they one and all have been forgetting that there is only one way in which peace can be secured, and that is by keeping themselves in readiness to enforce it, if necessary. We do not mean to say that there are not men in each at the moment who see the grim folly of the

situation, and sigh for their country, and its fatuous idea that talking of peace is the only thing necessary to secure it. Unfortunately the bulk of the population in all three have allowed themselves to fall into a somnolent condition, and are too lazy or too indifferent to the lessons of the past, to read the book set open before their eyes.

If history be of any value it is to teach us that the nation that has once lost its self-regard is already half-way on the road to ruin. Little nations such as were the United Netherlands in the time of PHILIP III., can keep at bay even the strongest, if they only have confidence in themselves; the most powerful, if it once permit its foundations to be sapped by the burrowing rate of faction and disorder, cannot survive the first flood. This latter is unfortunately the present position of all three. Under the foolish pretext of respect for liberty, all three have permitted the rate of discontent to undermine the resources of the state, and for the moment they lie practically at the mercy of the first Power that makes a strong attack on their independence. In Europe we see evidence of weakness in the continual references to what Germany will think of our own alliances. When a man or a nation begins to consult the neighbours as to whom he or it shall invite to his board, the onlooking world begins to look on him or it as afflicted by the gods; yet this is very much the position occupied by the three Powers, who within the last quarter of a century had the greatest influence in the shaping of events. The issue of the last Convention at the Hague goes far to show how little of that influence now remains. On the contrary our namby-pamby ministers, with a still more feeble and foolish majority in the House of Commons, are doing their best to draw on ourselves the contempt of the whole of the Continental Powers by the silly habit of reaching to others what they are unable to enforce on themselves. Yet in the face of all this, as though the world were only waiting the nod of one or other before undertaking any business, France, England, and the United States are wilfully permitting their armies and navies to dwindle in comparison with the other Powers, and seem bent to make an exhibition of their own inaptitude to resist any insult however gross. Both England and France have had to bear their more than fair share of snubs during the last two years. There are signs that the United States are quickening for the same treatment. Now it is no new rule in this world that snubs unnoticed have a habit of turning into insults, and insults once submitted to as certainly grow into injuries. We have got pretty well on towards the second stage of the programme; whether we shall be able to stop short of the third depends on our retracing the false steps of the past, and putting our house in better order.

DEFECTIVE ENGINEERING.

(Daily Press, 21st October.)

It is seldom that an accident, if it may be called an accident occurs involving so much loss of life and property as the fall during construction of the great railway bridge intended to cross the river St. Lawrence a few miles below Quebec. It is, however, to all appearance fortunate that the collapse occurred when it did, and was not postponed till a later period when more property would have been put into the work, and a larger number of workmen would have been engaged. The bridge was being erected from one side, no intermediate support being

possible, and this was rendered practicable from the adoption of the cantilever system in its construction. The system is well known through the successful completion of the great Forth bridge across the Frith of Forth, and this has remained up to the present day the widest single span in the world, its width from the centres of the piers amounting to 1710 feet. Apparently as a mere *tour de force* to exceed this, and so take the record across the Atlantic the St. Lawrence bridge was fixed at 1800. Owing to the depth of the river, and the necessity of avoiding ice pressure there was probably not much margin to spare, but a section of the banks at both sides would seem to indicate that an advance of the piers at each side of some 50 feet towards the centre could have been effected without practically increasing the danger from ice shoves, and a saving of one panel in the length of the overhang at each side would possibly have averted the disaster. A few comparisons with the Forth Bridge are interesting as showing the recklessness of this latest piece of American engineering. In the Forth bridge the chief compression members are formed of heavy tubes 12½ feet in diameter; in the attempted Quebec bridge, the compression members, when the bridge failed, are of laminated steel plates 5½ feet deep, and 4½ feet wide, and the overhang was some 750 feet, the two struts being about 67 feet apart. When the bridge would have been finished the overhang at each side would have been 562½ feet, and across the gap of 675 feet between the two ends was to have been placed an enormous centre girder weighing, when complete, between 3,500 and 4,000 tons. We may reduce these measures to one fiftieth, and see what this meant. We would then have a bracket projecting from the point of springing 11½ feet, supported by two arched trusses 1½ inches by 1 inch not of solid steel but of several laminated strips of about the thickness of ordinary writing paper; moreover these two trusses were just 1.4 inches apart, were tied by light braces together at intervals of 13 inches, but otherwise had no side bracing to prevent them from warping: on the end then of this was to be suspended a dead weight of half a hundred, and moreover from time to time, but many times a day, a moving weight of 20 to 25 lbs. was to traverse the entire backwards and forwards: with this we can have some idea of the structure. The steel in the Forth bridge was equal to a strain of 34 to 37 tons per square inch; that used at Quebec was only equal to 28, or nearly 20 per cent. weaker. The steel in the Forth bridge would never have to bear more than 7½ tons per square inch; on the other hand the calculated strain on the Quebec bridge amounted to 14½ tons, or half its ultimate strength; while at the time of the collapse, but before the full strain was actually imposed, the strain seems to have amounted to 8 tons per square inch.

It is plain then that notwithstanding the dangerous approach to the ultimate strength, designed to have been only 50 per cent. of the actual crushing weight, as against the 80 per cent. margin insisted on in English work, the collapse was not due to actual crushing, but arose from a no less plain cause; which is moreover familiar to every engineer of standing, and should have been equally apparent to the engineers of the Phoenix Bridge Company of Pennsylvania, who were entrusted with the work. Every one knows that although a pillar may have sufficient sectional area to bear heavy weight placed on it vertically if, say, six feet long, a pillar with exactly the same sectional area if made twelve feet long with-

out bracing will only support a small fraction of the same weight, owing to its greater liability to warp. This was the important factor that was left quite out of the count by the engineers for the bridge. It is difficult to believe that the manufacturers could have taken the precaution to have had an actual model of the work carefully made to scale, or the inadequacy of the bracing would have at once struck the eye of any skilled designer. We have attempted to exhibit the insufficiency of the staying by references to figures, an actual model would have emphasised the defects. The fall of the Tay bridge many years ago drew the attention of English engineers to the necessity of taking thought of these out of the ordinary strains to which large structures are at all times liable; and one of the results of the lesson is seen in the great Forth bridge. It may be that that structure has been made in excess of the actual requirements of the case. The margin of 1 to 5 may not always be required, and the larger the structure, the less proportionate allowance may reasonably be made for emergencies; but on the other hand no engineer is entitled to consider that he will be justified in ignoring emergencies. This, however, there is too much reason to believe is the ordinary practice of the American engineer. However successfully it may have been concealed, the truth will in the long run out, and the Quebec disaster is probably not the last of which we shall hear, all proceeding from the same evil habit. It is more difficult to account for the defective designs having been passed by the consulting engineer to the syndicate at whose expense the bridge was being put up; but in this respect too, American practice differs much for the worse from English. In England the engineer is always held responsible for errors of judgment, if he have not in the first instance have had actually to design the work. In America the practice is too much to ignore the consulting engineer and go in the first instance to the contractor. The contractor has every inducement to reduce the expense of the work to the uttermost, and the temptation is strong to cut things below the margin of safety: in the present case the temptation was more than doubled by the desire to outcap the Britisher. It was the biggest thing that had ever been done, and the desire was strong to go beyond the Britisher in his own particular line. To build the biggest span in the world, and do it with an economy of steel such as the slow-going Englishman would never think of, was to be the triumph of the Phoenix Company; but one thing was forgotten, and that was safety. True safety in America is a matter of little consequence, but even it may be strained, and the loss of half a million dollars at least is a poor compensation for an unwise ambition.

CHINA.

(Daily Press, October 22nd.)

The more it changes, the more it is the same thing, should have been a Chinese, rather than a French, epigram. The Shanghai correspondent of the London Times writes recently of China as "changing and changeless", and gives his reasons. He makes it very clear, though without explicitly saying so, that the Dowager-EMPRESS is the clog on the wheel of reform. "The ear of the Court appears to be open always to the last comer—its sympathies as variable as its humours, so that throughout

the country, and especially in the north, there exists a condition of uneasiness and unrest, a condition offering little prospect of that definite responsibility and abolition of corruption which the Throne so earnestly desired. So marked is this feeling of uneasiness, so apparently aimless the policy of the central Government in matters of administration, that a Censor has advocated postponement of reform in the provinces on the ground that, to judge by the results at Peking they could not safely bear the burden it entails." Early next month it will be a year since we quoted the unequivocal Edicts promising constitutional reform, Edicts that were so cunningly worded as to deceive many people into belief and faith, but we were ungallant enough to doubt their sincerity and to disbelieve in their fruition. Of course there is plenty of time yet—twelve months of Cathay is no more than twelve minutes of Europe—and if the Reform Party were stronger, and the EMPEROR back on his throne, some achievement might follow the recent promises. At present, however, as our observant authority notes, "the collapse of the Viceroy Yuan Shih-kai's policy before the intrigues of the Hu-nan party, and the renewed activity of the conservative *literati* have apparently reassured the Empress-Dowager, so that, for the moment, the execution of the Reform Edicts is as remote as that of the Mackay Treaty or any other of the temporary expedients which strew the tortuous path of Chinese diplomacy." As to the probability of a pure administration, the pessimists are more confirmed than ever they were. The impeachment of Prince CHING affords a telling illustration. We reported it at the time, with the succeeding statement that His Highness had been exonerated and vindicated, and the censor who denounced him cashiered. Censor CHAO memorialized the EMPRESS-DOWAGER, some say after Viceroy SHUM had inspired him, that Prince CHING had accepted a large bribe, and that his son TSAI-CHEN, President of the Nung-kungshangpu, had received a handsome singing-girl, from the recently-promoted governor TUAN. Just then the EMPRESS-DOWAGER's card was administrative integrity, and after a decent interval, and with Prince CHING's assent and collusion, the inquisition was opened, with the result already stated. The morality of Peking was firmly established. The Times correspondent now plumply informs us that during the few days between the publication of the impeachment and the acquittal of the impeached, "arrangements were made for the removal from Peking of the singing girl and other *pièces de conviction*." He asserts this unhesitatingly, as an undoubted truth, and we could accept it on slenderer authority, from previous incidents. No wonder that he thus concludes: "the situation, in fact, under the reformed régime is precisely what it was under the Wai-wu-pu. *Plus ça change plus c'est la même chose.*"

CHINESE CUSTOMS.

(Daily Press, October 23rd.)

Amongst the more unexpected accompaniments of the great Boxer Uprising of 1900 has been the decided strengthening of the central control over the entire Empire of China that has followed in its train. This has been in the main brought about by the desire on the part of foreign governments, not always, nor even generally dictated by feelings of benevolent consideration for China, to secure the regular payment of the

interest accruing on the somewhat arbitrarily adjudged indemnities found due to the various Powers in accordance with the Protocol of 1900. One of the stipulations of that instrument was that the local Customs within a certain distance of each of the treaty ports should be placed under the control of the adjacent Foreign Customs establishment; and the third series of reports of the administrations, containing this time the greater number of the ports, has lately been published under the title of Quinquennial Reports, and Returns of Native Customs Trade Returns. The result to the Central Government has been a substantial addition to its annual revenue of nearly four million taels, and the amount under improved management, or to be more precise under management of any description, is yearly increasing. Owing to the radical nature of the transfer from local to imperial control the work of the Imperial Customs, except in the case of the Tientsin Customs, where the work had been carried on fully during the military occupation, has had to be carried out cautiously and by degrees; so as to injure as little as possible the large vested interests concerned. Looking at the returns from a merely statistical point of view, we learn little that we did not know previously as to the ordinary course of trade. By far the greater portion of the trade of the ports has long ago left the slow and uninsurable junk to take refuge on board the steamer, foreign or Chinese; coarse goods such as bamboos, native poles, coarse china ware, and the ordinary crops of the districts forming almost the entire cargoes, left for the junk. Still in 1906 upwards of 500 junks entered at the native Custom House at Tientsin, bringing cargoes of the value of one and a quarter million taels, and the entire collection amounted to 1,195,000 taels. The interest of the tables is, however antiquarian rather than immediate, and the lesson to be learnt is from what a slough of despond the introduction of foreign trade and the Maritime Customs saved the whole Chinese Empire. It has often been asserted by those who had studied most the condition of China, that her Government got practically nothing out of the vast coasting trade of the country, and that even the provincial governments, owing to the absence of any system of collection, fared little better; the greater part of the enormous dues in the aggregate collected being squandered in merely keeping alive the collectors. It was also a subject of common remark that there existed no regular tariff, and that the individual who got to the right side of the collector could get his goods passed at a merely nominal rate, while he who had neglected this preliminary had to pay through the nose. Still foreigners and officials who were in the habit of looking to China as a model of order and good government could not be brought to believe these charges; and men otherwise able, like Sir J. DAVIS or Sir HENRY POTTINGER, professed to poo-poo all these in their anxiety to prove of what an inferior order of being was the British merchant who came to China for the sole purpose of vilifying its government, and making illicit profit out of the simple-mindedness of its officials. These returns disclose a still worse condition of affairs than had been ever represented.

At Tientsin, Mr. P. C. HANSSON thus describes the former condition of affairs: "But little is known of the old Native Customs prior to the Boxer rising. From what is known, however, it is safe to state that its administration differed in no material respect from those of other Native Custom Houses in China, i. e. the amounts

of revenue which found their way into the Imperial and provincial exchequers were small; no written rules and regulations existed—they were stored in the shupans' (native clerks) heads; and the payment of duties was therefore a matter of private bargains. Finally natives who ought to know assert that no less than 10,000 persons were dependent, at least for a fraction of their livelihood, on their connection with the Tientsin Custom House, and that there were several hundred persons who had inherited rights in the proceeds of the Native Customs—rights acquired years ago at a heavy expenditure by their forefathers. That the above figures are not a *façon de parler* after-experience of the actual yield of this department would seem to show."

He quotes a statement by Mr. GEORGE JAMIESON taken from the *Peking Gazette* in illustration of this. In 1892 the Customs Taotai reported the takings of the Native Customs at 93,923 taels, of which he remitted 68,000 taels to the Imperial exchequer; little wonder that Mr. HANSSON should exclaim; what a blessing in disguise the Boxer rising has turned out for the Imperial Exchequer! So far as there are any regulations, the latest tariff generally seems to have been compiled towards the close of the eighteenth century, but affairs have naturally so much altered in the course of trade within the century and a quarter, that the chief clerk at each station made his own tariff, wherein his own pocket was the chief consideration. These reports, short as they are, throw considerable light on the past history of China. Thus the following extract from that on Shanghai made by Mr. H. E. HOBSON shows us a state of affairs not long past, but yet of interest: "The hsiao-yang-yao-chuan owe their origin to the troublous times of the Taiping Rebellion. In those days 33 Cantonese opium hongs subscribed the sum of taels 100,000, and paid it to the then Shanghai superintendent, TING JICH'ANG, for the privilege of arming and equipping boats to carry their opium to the Kiangpoh district for sale. There are still twelve of these boats afloat each of which is in possession of a special pass issued by the Taotai. They trade only to the Kiangpoh; they carry miscellaneous cargo, and are still allowed to be armed, though their original occupation of trading in opium disappeared long ago."

Again at Amoy, Mr. BOWRA gives an account of the ancient trade. Speaking of the Zayton of MARCO POLO, he remarks: "A veil falls between China and Europe on the expulsion of the Mongols, and when it rises in the sixteenth century Zayton has disappeared—disappeared so completely that a controversy has raged over the identification of the site. Into the details of this it is needless to enter, for the weight of evidence—to the mind of the writer at least—sustains the plea advocated stoutly by the late Mr. GEORGE PHILLIPS for many years—that the modern district city of Haiteng, situated at the entrance of the Changchow River, and formerly called Gehkong, the port to the city of Changchow till superseded by Amoy, occupies the site of the port of the celebrated medieval town." Of the present arrangements he adds that in 1738 all Customs affairs were made the care of the Tartar General; and this arrangement, he says, still holds. These are some of the curious arrangements of times long passed away that still remain to connect the China of the present with that of MARCO POLO: they are doubly interesting at the present, now that change in place of primitive stagnation is becoming the order of the day in China, as well as elsewhere.

BED AND BUSINESS.

(Daily Press, October 24th.)

A gentleman named WILLIAM WILLETT has discovered that on an average two hundred and ten hours of daylight every year are "wasted" by every person in England. It does not appear from his pamphlet that he is one of those annoying people who consider every moment of inaction a sin. It is daylight, and not time, that he desires to see fully utilized. It must have occurred to everyone at some time or other that if people rose and retired with the sun, a great deal of the unnecessary expense of living would be saved. Mr. WILLETT sees further that people would have more time for healthy outdoor recreation. As quoted by a contemporary, he would cut off some of the morning hours and add them on to the afternoon. This, he proceeds to show, could be effected by no greater task than that of putting the clocks of the nation on a few minutes, and back a few minutes, at stated intervals according to the rise and fall of the year. The months selected for this change would be most naturally April and September. Between October 1 and March 31 ordinary Greenwich time would be observed. But in April the clocks would begin to be put forward, let us say, twenty minutes at a time for four successive Sundays at 2 a.m., in order to choose an hour that would be most generally convenient. At the end of the month there would be a clear advance of an hour and twenty minutes in standard time which would automatically be added on to after-office hours, and thus business, apparently ending at 6 p.m., would really be done with by 4.40—an obvious gain for the purposes of air and exercise. Similarly in September the clock would be put back twenty minutes on four Sunday mornings, in order to bring the movements of the community back to standard time. The change in either direction could thus be made so gradually as to be hardly noticeable, at the sole cost of submitting to four days of twenty-three hours forty minutes, and four of twenty-four hours twenty minutes in the whole year. As Mr. Willett remarks: "Those who have travelled by sea east or west will remember how easily they accommodated themselves to the frequent alterations of time on board ship;"—which alterations, it may be observed, are far more violent than those that he suggests.

At first it looked like a bit of Silly Season twaddle, but London seems to have been taking it seriously, and the *North China Herald* as gravely recommends the idea to Shanghai. In the hot summer months at Hongkong, we have sometimes thought it might be an advantage to turn night into day, working or playing through the comparatively cooler night hours and sleeping during the day, but it was merely a random thought, and ignored as it deserved. We cannot see that there is any advantage in playing with our clocks as suggested. Those who want to use more daylight for recreation may rise earlier in the morning; there is nothing to hinder them. In the East, many people do so, riding or swimming before breakfast. The simpler way, though it would tend to dislocate business, would be to let the clocks tick on with their usual regularity, and adjust office hours to the seasons. Make the working day in winter an hour or two shorter, and in summer an hour or two longer. But as mails come and go in winter much as they do in summer, and work must be done, we do not press the suggestion as an urgent reform. There is one matter raised in the discussion, however, that seems worth passing notice, and that is the folly of those who are foolishly anxious to "map out their time," and in so doing think it heroic to curtail the hours of sleep. It is practically certain that the author of the "early to bed and early to rise" saw was a taskmaster concerned more

with the accomplishing of his tasks than with the future health, wealth and wisdom of his auditors. The man who perpetrated that other saw about six hours sleep being sufficient for a man, seven for a woman, eight for a child, and nine for a fool, was something still worse, and we trust has had his reward. According to SHAKESPEARE, it is "sleep that knits up the ravelled sleeve of care," and it is gratifying to find that modern common-sense is overcoming the old humbug. We read now that it is impossible to sleep too much. A recent authority writes:

How the superstition ever grew up that there is such a thing as weakening yourself by oversleeping I cannot imagine. Whatever may have been the source of the delusion, it is utterly without basis in physiology. No one ever got too much healthy, natural sleep, or injured himself physically by staying in bed until he felt rested. Most men and all women would be better for a nap of from twenty minutes to an hour after the midday meal. Sleeplessness is even more emphatically a sign of disease in children than in adults. To make children or rapidly growing young adults get up before they have had their sleep out, and feel thoroughly rested, is not merely irrational but cruel, and when it is done as a routine at boarding schools, or other institutions, by those who pretend to be fitted to have the care of children, it is little short of criminal.

The writer knocks the old "beauty sleep" fallacy determinedly on the head. There is no foundation for it, and still less for the notion about one hour before midnight being worth two afterwards. This latter idea has grown up "with the early-rising fetish." There is nothing to prove that the last two hours' sleep do not give fully as much rest as the first two. Nor is there any necessary physiological connection between sleep and darkness. The reason why working by night and sleeping by day is often injurious is because of the lack of sunlight. The writer would have had much sympathy with the schoolboy who made his famous retort to the paternal admonition on the subject of the early bird catching the worm. There is no advantage, he asserts, in early rising in itself. It is a survival from more primitive times when our agricultural ancestors had to work in daylight only, and when candles were dear. Civilisation and late hours always go hand in hand. He says further:

Nor is there any adequate support for the impression that the early morning hours are in any way more wholesome or healthy than later periods of the day. Except in summer time they are apt to be damp, foggy, chilly, and among the least desirable hours of daylight. It is quite true that during the summer there is a sense of exhilaration about being abroad in these early morning hours, but this evaporates with the dew, and is apt to be succeeded by a corresponding depression and loss of working power later in the day.

EVIDENCE.

(Daily Press, October 25th.)

It is curious how a sentiment or idea passing from mouth to mouth, repeated parrot-wise and still passed on, can become crystallised into something like a popular conviction. The number of men in Hongkong who have lately expressed it as their private and particular and deliberately evolved opinion that no man should ever be convicted on the capital charge on the strength of "circumstantial evidence" is incalculable, but we have reason to estimate it at something large. The first man who set the *ou dit* rolling among the TOMLINSONS was doubtless thinking of historical incidents read and remembered, in which capital punishment had, as it afterwards turned out, wrongly and unjustly followed inferences and deductions from circumstances prim,

facie suspicious. One or two unjust executions, based on suspicious circumstances afterwards explained away, are enough to make men chary of accepting anything short of the most conclusive evidence; and it is certain that many an unfortunate has been hanged by the English law on very slender circumstantial evidence indeed. There was, in fact, a time when circumstances were strained and twisted by the prosecution somewhat after the manner described by DICKENS in the famous trial of BARDELL *v.* PICKWICK. On the other hand, it is obvious that if no murderers were to be punished save those caught red-handed, or testified against by eye-witnesses of the crime, a great many undesirable characters would be turned loose upon Society, and the number of such crimes—about two hundred a year in the United Kingdom—would inevitably increase. It is not "circumstantial evidence" that needs to be shied at, but the paucity of it. One or two suspicious circumstances are not enough for a verdict of guilty, and jurors and the public do right to hesitate. When there is a whole chain of such suspicious or incriminating circumstances, however, all dovetailing neatly, it is mere weakness to shirk the stern necessities of the case by a dislike for the somewhat misunderstood term "circumstantial evidence." In the great majority of cases, no other evidence is possible. Murderers do not usually go to work in the presence of witnesses. Suppose a man were known to have spent the day with another, and that other were found a bleeding corpse, with the man washing his hands and concealing a knife a few yards away, and that he made an attempt to run away when interrogated. There would be nothing but "circumstantial evidence" against him, and yet, in such circumstances, what man would believe in his innocence, what jury fail to convict? It is for the judge and jury to decide if the evidence, circumstantial or otherwise, is sufficiently strong in that particular case. There can be no generalising of the sort we have mentioned, no "principle" such as the one that has been passing current among the gossips of Hongkong lately. We do not think that any mistake was made by the last Grand Jury to sit at Hongkong. Their decision was based on as much certainty as is humanly possible.

We were struck by one feature of the ADSETTS trial that seems worth mentioning incidentally. It arose in the cross-examination of the witnesses to identification. They were asked to describe particular features, offhand, and not unnaturally were unable to do so. It seems almost supererogatory to explain the phenomena of "remembering faces," but for the sake of worried witnesses, we may perhaps point out a fallacy of the cross-examination. Cases of "mistaken identity" are sufficiently numerous to make cocksureness unbecoming, but on behalf of that not inconsiderable class of people who "never forget a face," we are obliged to point out that such test questions as were put to some of the witnesses prove nothing, even when they bring about the desired discomfiture. This knack of remembering faces does not depend upon a conscious and deliberate inventory of the component features. It might be impossible on Monday to describe any one feature of the face remembered, but confronted with it on the Tuesday, there would be no doubt, no hesitation, in saying, "that is the man." It seems to be a visual memory, a pictorial record in that section of the brain which waits upon the eye, and it needs the stimulus of the next seeing to revive it. How often do we not say, "I have seen

that face before, I am sure, but where?" To make the position clearer, ask any one of those clever and observant lawyers, in his office, to draw or describe the conformation of the Peak, as it appears from the harbour, and to tell you the approximate number of prominent buildings. Though seen by them hundreds of times, they would all fail as ignominiously as the witness who could not remember the colour of the prisoner's eyes. But now take them away, for a week, a year, even for twenty years. Bring them then into the harbour, without telling them where they are: is it likely they would hesitate to identify the scene, with certainty, beyond reasonable doubt? Apparently, however, the law excuses such methods of fighting the case for the accused. The cross-examining counsel for the defence, "in the exercise of his ingenuity", as it was gravely put the other day, may ignore recognised facts, and by baffling and confusing the witnesses put even honest and well-meaning persons in an extremely unenviable light. The accused's need is so great that the witnesses are expected to "grin and bear" these discomforts. Still, it does not seem quite fair, or conducive to pure justice.

PARTY.

(Daily Press, October 26th.)

The American Secretary for War, Mr. TAFT, since he has left Hongkong's hospitable shore for the more familiar environment of Manila, has done a great deal of talking, as was to be expected. The British parliamentary tradition lingers with Americans, who have a prodigious partiality for oratory, for what they think is eloquence. Sometimes this "infirmity of noble minds" leads to something suspiciously like the outpourings at a young man's debating club, and sometimes the necessity of saying something produces what we are obliged to call humbug. One remark that Mr. TAFT has just made to his friends the Filipinos was to our mind quite unexpected and surprising. He dwelt on the necessity of the Filipinos learning English, and expressed a hope that they would acquire such an education as would save them from the weakness of following this or that man, and enable them to think for themselves. It was a virtuous wish, a noble and praiseworthy ideal, and we could, had we sufficient faith in its probability, pray for its realization in the case of people other than the Filipinos. But what a surprising ideal to emanate from an American from America, where the system of party government is carried to its greatest extreme, where "bosses" and other leaders conduct the mobs by their sonorous noses, and where, if anywhere, the national interests are habitually sacrificed to those of faction. Was it not an eminent Bostonian who left on record his serious conviction that war was made on Spain for no worthier purpose than to keep a party in power? We do not mention these things in any pharisaic spirit. England is also party ridden, and we are still far from realizing the poet's dream of a time when none will be for Party, but all will be for State. It was party considerations pure and simple—or impure and duping the simple—which brought the Chinese coolies back from South Africa; it is nothing but party necessities that allows politicians to continue reviving the foolish hopes of the Irish nationalists; and it is probably sheer funk, and want of confidence in the existing majority, that threatens to thrust the people further beneath the intolerant heel of the testotal fanatics. Paradoxically, however, it promises to be in England a case of the more parties the

better, for with the numerous splits now apparent, we see principles coming into their own again, and fewer sordid compromises. We would no more dream of attacking the party system than we would of defying a typhoon, for such things we know must be. The two original great parties were the Strong and the Weak, and we have watched the strife of their modified posterity, the Rich and the Poor, the Educated and the Ignorant, Capital and Labour, the Practical and the Impractical, and so on, without doubting for an instant that such divisions are natural and inevitable and possibly advantageous in the end, just as in the cosmos we must have light and darkness, good and evil, positive and negative. But it would certainly make the parties more vital and useful if their constituents were produced on Mr. TAFT's formula, instead of growing like TOMMY, or, as Mr. W. S. GILBERT has put it, being born little Liberals and little Conservatives. It is to be hoped the education which is being forced upon the Filipinos may have better results than it has had on the masses of England and—dare we say it?—of America. In both countries the mass of voters still prefer vicarious thinking. Lest we seem to assert too much, let us call attention to the remarks printed elsewhere in this issue, made by an observer whom the Americans themselves have been pleased to accept as trustworthy. Mr. JAMES BRYCE says that the increase of knowledge, of which American educationalists boast, has not meant an increase of intellectual vigour, and President SCHURMAN, of Cornell University, U.S.A., says that though Americans are probably the most intelligent human beings who ever trod this planet, their intelligence is too much of the newspaper order, their knowledge superficial, inaccurate, chaotic, and ill-digested. He would have the rising generation trained to think, and not merely to read and perceive. Unfortunately, his colleagues do not all think with him. Another American professor, whose name, unfortunately, we have failed to remember, was quite recently advising his "freshers" or sophomores to "keep up with the procession," to "follow the band-wagon", and so on, meaning that they were to attach themselves to a party and work enthusiastically for that party through thick and thin. Already there is too great a tendency in both countries to join a faction as a bride is expected to join her husband, for better or worse, and we fear that too often, in both cases, the attachment is formed with as little thought. An immature Radical reads only the Radical papers, and would probably think it as wicked to study the Opposition propaganda as it is for a theological student to study materialistic or agnostic literature. Mr. Taft asked the Filipinos to learn to think for themselves, but somewhat discounted his own advice by warning them not to seek to divide Filipinos and Americans. Why not, if independent thinking brings a man to believe in the independence of the Philippines?

On October 17th was published a decree complaining of the constant unrest in the various provinces of the Empire, and laying the blame upon the high provincial authorities whose indifference or worse, with regard to the conduct of their subordinates has brought about such an undesirable state of affairs. The punishment of a couple or so of civil or military officials in the disturbed districts is no remedy at all and it has, therefore, been decided by the Throne that from henceforth Viceroy and Governors coming to office in any province are to be held responsible if six months after their arrival any disturbance or insurrection should arise within their several jurisdictions.

COMPANIES.

CANTON INSURANCE OFFICE, LD.

The twenty-sixth ordinary meeting of shareholders in the Canton Insurance Office, Ltd., was held at the office of the company, Messrs Jardine, Matheson and Co., on October 25th. Hon. Mr. H. Keswick presided, and there were also present Sir Paul Chater, Messrs. G. C. Moxon, F. Maitland, H. P. White, E. Shellim (consulting committee), H. Percy Smith, P. C. Potts, Ho Kom-tong, Lo Chaung-shui, Ho U-shau, Fok Kam-yim, Chan Sam and Wong Leung-him.

The SECRETARY read the notice calling the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN said—Gentlemen, I presume that you wish me to take the report and accounts as read. The Working Account for the year 1906 has, as you will see, closed to date with a credit balance of \$436,959.27. This whilst not so good as that for the two last years compares very favourably with the results of a long succession of years prior to 1904. There is one feature of the accounts to which I would specially allude—namely the proposal to inaugurate an Underwriting Suspense Account. As you know we are required by our articles of association to present our accounts before 31st October. In October, however, the Working Account of the year is not fully matured, and the policy of the Board for some years past (in view of the incomplete information as to the final results of the year that must exist at this date) has been to increase the amount carried forward so as to avoid the risk of paying away in dividends or of appropriating to the standing reserve of the Office a sum that has not at that date actually been earned. Last year's report you may recollect witnessed a larger carry forward than that of the preceding year which again was in excess of any of its predecessors. This year also the results enable us to give a further and more marked expression to this policy by carrying forward the greater sum of \$286,000 to hold in suspense against the outstanding claims for 1906 and former years. We propose however this year, with your permission, to carry this amount to a Specific Account to be called an Underwriting Suspense Account and when the working account for 1907 is presented the amount under the heading "losses and claims" will include only those claims that actually fall upon 1907 policies. Your Committee are also of opinion that it is to the advantage of the Office, whilst keeping the major portion of its funds at Reserve, to have a further portion in a more liquid form and the proposal to form an Underwriting Suspense Account affords a suitable opportunity to accomplish this and at the same time to initiate this account on a sound and substantial basis. By the transfer of \$115,000 from the Reserve we achieve this dual object and place the Underwriting Suspense Account at slightly over four lacs. I am afraid that this proposal has given rise to some apprehensions, or rather misapprehensions, that the underwriting results of the Office have been exceptionally unfavourable. I am glad that the existence of such a fear has reached me as it enables me to take this opportunity of stating that it is without justification and we do not estimate that it will cost more to close the year 1906, than to close 1905. Whether this amount of \$115,000 appears under credit of Reserve Account or of Underwriting Suspense Account its nature of a reserve is unaltered, though under the latter Account it is a more liquid asset. With a reserve account of \$1,560,000 and our invested funds amounting in all to some \$3,000,000 I fancy that you will agree with me that our position is not unsatisfactory and we are glad to again recommend a dividend of \$20 a share. The investments of the Office invite I think little comment. Our Mortgages have been well reported upon by our Surveyors, and in spite of the depression in the property market are all in a satisfactory state while the values of the respective properties show good margins over the sums advanced. Our Japanese bonds appear at the reduced book value, which is the result of the appropriation made last year, and they, as well as our U. S. Bonds now stand in our books at considerably less than their market

value. Before proposing that the report and accounts as presented be passed I shall be pleased to do my best to answer any questions that shareholders may desire to put.

No questions were asked, and the CHAIRMAN proposed the adoption of the report and accounts as presented.

Mr. Ho Kom-Tong seconded, and the proposition was agreed to unanimously.

Sir Paul Chater, Messrs. F. Maitland, H. P. White, E. Shellim and G. C. Moxon were re-elected to the consulting committee on the motion of Mr. Potts, seconded by Mr. PERCY SMITH.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that Messrs. H. Percy Smith and W. H. Potts be elected auditors.

Mr. SHELLIM seconded, and the motion was carried.

The CHAIRMAN—Dividend warrants will be posted early to-morrow morning, gentlemen. I thank you for your attendance.

NORTH CHINA INSURANCE CO. LD.

The report for presentation at the fourth ordinary general meeting of shareholders, to be held at Shanghai, on Tuesday, 22nd October reads—

The Directors beg to submit, for the information of shareholders, the annexed duly audited statement of the Company's accounts to the 30th June, 1907.

1906.—The Balance at credit of this account is Taels 161,959.36, and after deducting an interim dividend of 7½ per cent, aggregating Taels 5,945.95, paid on the 1st May last, there remains a sum of Taels 136,013.41, which the Directors recommend should be appropriated in the following manner:—

A Final Dividend of 7½ per cent, on the paid-up capital.

A bonus of 15 per cent, upon contributory premiums.

And the Balance to be transferred to underwriting reserve account, closing the account for 1906.

As outstanding risks have been running off satisfactorily, it is proposed to transfer £15,000 from Underwriting Reserve Account to the permanent Sterling Reserve, thereby bringing this Fund up to £125,000.

1907.—The Balance at credit of working account to 30th June amounts to Taels 204,424.46.

Directors.—In accordance with the provisions of the Articles of Association the Directors all retire, but being eligible, offer themselves for re-election.

Audit.—The accounts have been audited by Mr. Hayter, Mr. Wingrove being absent on leave.

Messrs. Wingrove and Hayter again tender their services to the shareholders.

By Order of the Court of Directors.

WM. GEORGE BAYNE.

Dr. BALANCE SHEET 30th June, 1907.			
	Taels	£	s. d.
To capital account:			
10,000 shares at £5			
£50,000 at 2 11-36	335,078.53	50,000	0 0
To sterling reserve fund	737,172.78	110,000	0 0
To silver fund	100,000.00	14,921	17 6
To underwriting reserve account	376,622.91	56,199	4 0
To exchange and investment fluctuation account	48,942.33	7,303	3 0
To working account 1906:			
Amount brought forward			
from below			
low	Tls. 161,959.36		
Deduct—			
Interim Shares			
Divided Tls. 25,945.95			
	136,016.41	20,295	15 0
To working 1907:			
Amount brought forward			
from below	204,424.46	30,503	19 3
To Sundry Creditors	4,887.58	729	6 5
(Ex. 2 11-36 per Tael)	1,943,142.50	£289,953	5 11
By cash on current and deposit accounts in Shanghai	185,866.16	27,731	14 4
By Chinese imperial Govt. Loan of 1886 (E. Issue)	13,500.00	2,014	9 1
By Shanghai Municipal Loans	95,062.00	14,185	0 8
By Shanghai land investment Co., Ltd.'s 5 per cent debts	7,000.00	10,144	10 8

By land Shanghai investment Co., Ltd.'s 5 per cent debts	69,700.00	10,400	10 11
By Shanghai Waterworks Co., Ltd.'s 5 per cent debentures	9,600.00	1,432	10 0
By Shanghai Waterworks Co., Ltd.'s 5 per cent Debentures	20,000.00	2,984	7 6
By Shanghai and Hongkew Wharf Co., Ltd.'s 6 per cent Debts	10,072.44	1,509	19 11
By Shanghai Mutual Telephone Co., Limited	800.00	119	7 6
By Mortgages on Property in Shanghai	190,000.00	19,398	8 9
By Japanese Government 5 per cent Yen Loan of 1895	10,338.63	1,543	14 5
By Japanese Government 4 per cent Sterling Loan of 1899	58,791.40	8,772	16 7
By London Branch—Balance, viz:			
London Freehold Premises 38,307	3 7		
Cash at Bankers	11,569	7 10	
British Government Securities	22,407	16 6	
Indian Government Securities	18,958	14 5	
Colonial Government Securities	29,829	6 1	
Chinese gold 5 per cent Loan of 1896	10,296	14 7	
Chinese imperial railway 5 per cent Loan of 1899	4,690	0 0	
Chinese imperial railways (Shanghai-Nanking)	8,000	0 0	
Japanese Govt. 4 per cent Loan of 1905	4,325	2 6	
Royal Prussian Govt. 4½ per cent Loan	3,000	0 0	
English railway securities	5,214	11 1	
Indian railway securities	18,482	14 0	
Canadian Pacific railway 5 per cent 1st mort. debentures	5,375	0 0	
Furniture accounts—London & Manchester	175	10 0	
Premia outstanding, bills receivable, policy stamps and drafts in course of collection	6,101	1 10	
	£186,841	2 4	
Less—due to sundries	1,213	2 4	
	1,243,999.27	185,628	0 4
By balance at branches	58,035.16	8,662	18 4
By furniture at Head Office and Branches	1,966.86	248	14 6
By sundry debtors	28,690.57	4,231	3 5
(Ex. 2 11-36 per Tael)			
Taels	1,943,142.50	£289,953	5 11
WORKING ACCOUNT, 1906.			
Dr.	30th June 1907.	Taels.	
To Net Premia		621,031.14	
To Interest		74,923.31	
To transfer and certificate fees		66.00	
		Taels	696,019.65
Cr.			
By commissions and charges at Head Office		169,692.84	
branches and agencies		4,904.00	
By directors' and auditors' fees		9,804.07	
By income tax		155.89	
By depreciation furniture account		349,547.99	
By losses and claims		161,959.36	
By balance carried forward		696,019.65	
		Taels	696,019.65
WORKING ACCOUNT 1907.			
Dr.	30th June 1907.	Taels.	
To net premia		316,191.60	
To interest		37,301.69	
To transfer and certificate fees		24.00	
		Taels	353,527.38
Cr.			
By commissions and charges at Head Office, branches and agencies		78,895.22	
By directors' and auditors' fees		2,450.00	
By income tax		2,322.38	
By losses and claims		65,435.37	
By balance carried forward		304,424.46	
		Taels	353,527.38

EVOLUTION OF HONGKONG.

[Written for the *Hongkong Daily Press*.]

(Continued from last week.)

IV.

It is neither necessary nor interesting to recount the story of the intercourse of the East India Company at Canton during the later years of the eighteenth century, and the first quarter of the nineteenth, further than to remark that it had lost the confidence of all, whether disciples of the coming school of Free Trade, or men simply anxious for the good name of their country.

Under its original Charter the East India Company had been granted a monopoly of British trade in Eastern seas. As the operations of the Company became more extensive, and commerce grew, it became necessary from time to time to define the rights of the Company in relation to private traders generally. It was gradually established that no British subject was entitled to land in China except under passport granted by the Directors; and that no British ship could participate in the trade except under special license from the Company, which license was liable to be withdrawn without notice at the discretion of the Select Committee at Canton, which had furthermore power to deport any British subject who contravened in any way its regulations. So jealous was the Company of its prerogative that practically these passports were only granted to a few private friends of the Directors at long intervals, and their holders were held to be private guests and were maintained at the general expense. Opium and some other commodities were conveyed to the coast of China in private ships, then denominated "country ships," but these vessels though private were strictly under the command of the Select Committee who had the power of cancelling their licenses and compelling them to depart.

But if the authority of the Committee were thus complete over all vessels carrying the British flag, it had from the nature of the case no control of any sort over foreign vessels; and this was more especially galling in the case of the Portuguese, Spaniards, and Dutch, whose intercourse was of older date than the Company, and who had their own understandings with the Chinese officials. Later other countries such as France and Denmark entered into the trade, and could not be excluded. They, however, generally worked with the Select Committee, and interfered little with the course of trade. It was naturally a different thing when after the declaration of Independence the United States sent their ships to take part in the trade, and a good deal of friction at the beginning naturally arose.

In 1813 the Charter of the Company expired, and in the growing desire in England for Reform of Parliament and the abolition of monopolies, it was with much trouble, and only on the condition that the political and mercantile interests of the East India Company should be separated, and that strict accounts of the latter should be annually published, that Parliament consented to an ad interim prolongation of the monopoly, but only for a term of twenty years. At home the same party that was agitating for the reform of Parliament was also a strong advocate of freeing trade from the shackles of high protection, and the abandonment of monopolies of all sorts. It was undeniably growing in strength, and was rapidly absorbing the growing intellect of the country, so that it was evident to all thinking minds that a change was imminent, and it was expedient that measures should be taken to prevent the change becoming explosive.

Although the East India Company struggled hard to maintain its monopoly of the trade of the Far East, the indications were clear that this would not be again extended, and that it would be wise to permit affairs to gradually take their course, in order to avoid a sudden disruption. Even before the expiry of their old charter in 1813 one or more British merchants had successfully evaded its provisions by taking out papers of foreign nationality, and in this it was notorious that they were backed up by parties in England high in power. This fact,

and the publication of the accounts showing enormous profits from the trade had their natural effect in bringing others to the front. The earliest pioneer of British private trade seems to have been Mr. William Jarline, who commenced his visits to China in 1802, but who did not become a regular resident till 1820. Next to him in point of time was Mr. Davidson, who, however, had become a naturalised Portuguese subject. After the renewal of the modified Charter, while the Company still had powers of repressing competition, but from prudential motives did not always care to press them to extremes, we find R. Inglis representing Dent and Co. about 1823, and the brothers Matheson coming a few years later. The Mathesons were more worthy of note as they boldly and openly attacked the monopoly at its seat, and in 1827 started the first newspaper in China, a weekly sheet denominated the *Canton Register*, to disseminate the doctrines of Free Trade then beginning to make a stir in the world; and more particularly to advocate the suppression of the East India Company's monopoly of the China trade. In this they were ably backed up by a large and powerful section of the home press, so that when the Reform Bill of 1831 was at last carried against the strong opposition of the privileged classes; and with the assistance of the Free Traders, men generally foresaw that the monopoly under the new Parliament was not likely to be renewed.

Under the circumstances the Company, finding no support in its retrogressive policy gradually relaxed its opposition to private trade and private traders; and began to make arrangements for winding up its affairs. Still so late as March 1830 we find the Committee in Canton addressing the board of Directors as to the necessity, in their opinion, of being vested "with sufficient power to control the private British merchant ships," which seems to have been at interference with what had now become inevitable.

Before, however, the final closure of the Company's monopoly a curious instance of the contempt into which it had succeeded in bringing the British prestige in China is recorded. On the 12th May 1839, the Fu-yuen in company with the Hoppe during the absence of the Company's representatives at Macao forcibly entered the Factory. It seemed that some two years before the residents had renewed some of the wharfage in front of the Factory, without it was alleged craving permission. The Fu-yuen deliberately walked into the dining room, and seeing a picture hanging up asked whose portrait it was, receiving an answer that it was the portrait of His Majesty George IV., he gave directions to have it uncovered and deliberately sat down with his back to it, sent for the linguists and asked how they dared to permit the ground in front of the factory to be altered: the first having replied that he had no power to interfere with the chief, the Fu-yuen ordered chains to be brought, and put on him, and threatened him further with decapitation in case within two days the premises were not restored to their former condition. As a memento of one of the final insults to which the Company in its eagerness for trade under any conditions of national humiliation was subjected, on the establishment of Government House in Hongkong the portrait was presented to the Governor, and still remains as a dumb witness of the old time.

In April 1834, the Charter of the Company finally expired, Parliament having decided that in the general interest of commerce it was best to abolish the monopoly, and throw open the eastern trade to all. The effects were immediately apparent in the enormous expansion of the trade. The struggle had lasted for more than twenty years and the men who had been keenest in the strife now found the time had arrived to reap their spoils; the Jardines, the Mathesons, the Dents, the Gibbs, the Turners, the Hollidays, the Inneses, — were ready to enter on the field their prowess had won, and for more than a generation kept the lead almost entirely in their hands. With their ascendancy commences the private history of Hongkong, for though the future Colony had not yet been founded, affairs were fast verging to a crisis; and its inauguration was merely a matter of time, and a short time as events proved.

The Chinese authorities were by no means unprepared for what was taking place, and saw that to control a number of free merchants in an open trade would be a far more difficult task than to order about the Company; which was so tender of its trade that the mere hint of stopping it for a few weeks was always sufficient to make its chiefs concur in any encroachment, however glaring or galling to the individual. We find them accordingly appealing to the British authorities to appoint a director who should have control of the entire body of the British mercantile community. The beau-ideal of the viceroy, who was the first to mention the subject was the Chinese guild system; so far as concerned their own personal affairs, into them he had no desire to enter; they might govern themselves by their own laws provided they did not interfere with his, when the two clashed the foreign custom must give way. In fact the system suggested was the counterpart of that and prevailed in the Arab settlement in the ninth century. Our modern commentators, without understanding the conditions, have in many cases been led astray by the claims of the Young China party that extraterritoriality is a thing that was forcibly thrust upon them by England in consequence of the high-handed action of the Canton authorities; the fact is that the Chinese Government itself prayed the British authorities to establish it. "And whereas," proceeds the original Order in Council issued on the withdrawal of the monopoly, "the officers of the Chinese Government resident in or near Canton, in the Empire of China, have signified to the Supracargoes of the East India Company at Canton the desire of that Government that effectual provision should be made by law for the good order of all his Majesty's subjects resorting to Canton, and for the maintenance of peace and due subordination amongst them; and it is expedient that effect should be given to such reasonable demands of the said Chinese Government; Now, therefore—" &c. The Chinese in one respect, indeed reckoned without their host; they had grown so accustomed to the submission of the Company, and its absolute control over its representatives, that they expected that the same ready acquiescence would be exhibited under the new regime; and had no idea that there was such a thing as British law, to which even the Sovereign has to submit; so finding that the new chiefs were unable to exercise the same arbitrary powers over their nationals, they attributed their disobedience to personal frowardness.

To support the necessary establishment the three Superintendents to be appointed in pursuance of the act were to have power to levy dues on tonnage and an ad valorem duty on goods conveyed in British ships, and in general, till fuller orders were granted, to exercise all rights and functions heretofore belonging to the office of the Company's Supracargoes. In pursuance of the act the three Superintendents named were Lord Napier of Muchoestoun, a captain in H.M. Navy, and Messrs. W. H. Plowden and J. P. Davis, two former members of the Company's Select Committee. On their departure Lord Palmerston, then His Majesty's Foreign Minister, gave them instructions, "to foster and protect the trade of his Majesty's subjects in China; to extend trade if possible to other ports in China; to induce the Chinese Government to enter into commercial relations with the British Government; and to seek with peculiar caution and circumspection to eventually establish direct diplomatic communication with the Imperial Court at Peking," as well as to take measures so far as possible to have the coast surveyed, as well as to have a look out for some practical place of refuge for British ships in case of hostilities.

[To be continued.]

Four men have been arrested by the Hung-hom police on a charge of being concerned in the murder of Im Tong, a widow, on the 4th inst. It was alleged that the conduct of the deceased since the death of her husband had not met with the approval of several people and probably actuated by jealousy a number of men called at her house on the 4th inst. and set on her with choppers and killed her, afterwards burying the body. The police became aware of the crime through an informer betraying his friends.

ADSETTS PLEADS FOR MERCY.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

William Hall Adsetts, found guilty by a special jury of the wilful murder of Gertrude Dayton and sentenced to death, has appealed to His Excellency the Governor for pardon. He had received letters from his family who were in great distress, especially his mother who was suffering from heart failure, and on that account he sought clemency at the hands of his Excellency the Governor. Adsetts, it appears, has an old and decrepit mother and a young brother in America who are supported by the exertions of a young sister. A letter from his sister reads as if he had previously confessed his guilt to her. She wrote that when Adsetts' mother received the news of her son's arrest on a charge of murder she collapsed, and he pleads that the shock of learning that her son is to be executed will prove fatal to her. Strictly speaking, Adsetts has made no confession. His statement is that after the dead woman and he had visited many houses of ill fame and drunk a large quantity of liquor, they returned to the Hongkong Hotel and quarrelled, Adsetts alleging that the woman continually provoked him. On this he struck her in the region of the heart and knocked her down.

He says he thought she was dead, and his reason for putting the band round her neck was to check the bleeding, and to make sure that life was extinct. It amounts to a plea of manslaughter, and through the chaplain, has gone to His Excellency the Governor. Adsetts sobs and weeps in his cell.

We understand the date of the execution has been fixed for November 13.

APPOINTMENTS.

His Excellency the Governor has been pleased to appoint Mr. H. H. J. Gompertz to act as Puisne Judge during the absence on leave of His Honour the Chief Justice, or until further notice. With the approval of the Secretary of State for the Colonies he has also been pleased to appoint the same gentleman, who was assistant Colonial Secretary, to the post of First Police Magistrate in succession to Mr. T. Sercombe Smith, who has been transferred to the service of the Straits Settlements. His Excellency has also, with the approval of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, appointed Mr. Cecil Clementi, Assistant Registrar-General, to the post of Assistant Colonial Secretary, in succession to Mr. Gompertz, promoted. Mr. Clementi's promotion causes a vacancy for an Assistant Registrar-General, and it has pleased the Governor to appoint Mr. E. D. C. Wolfe, cadet, to that position.

THE CHINESE FESTIVAL AT MACAO.

All last week crowds of Chinese from Hongkong, Canton and the neighbouring districts were pouring into Macao for the great festival which began on October 20th, was continued 21st and 22nd. Never in its history has the Colony of Macao been so crowded. For three or four months past a committee composed of four or five hundred Chinese residents had been engaged making arrangements for a festival of thanksgiving to the Plague Joss for his merciful delivery of the Colony from the scourge of plague early in the year. When the epidemic broke out, thousands of Chinese fled from the Colony, and did not return when Macao was able again to present a clean bill of health. Local trade was most injuriously affected; and so in order to recall the Chinese who had left, a festival of thanksgiving to the Plague Joss was conceived, a festival embracing spectacles of unparalleled magnificence which the dwellers in neighbouring ports and the country districts would come in their thousands to witness.

It scarcely needs to be mentioned that the popular belief of the Chinese is that to the Plague Joss alone is due the honour and the glory of having rid the Colony of the terrible scourge. When the epidemic became severe the Joss was taken from his accustomed abode in the Pagoda

and carried with due solemnity to one of the most plague-stricken districts of the Colony where it was enshrined in a makeshift, while flags and other relics of the Joss were carried to other stricken parts of the city. As if in response to the prayers of the devout (if we blot out of the picture the drastic measures taken by the Portuguese Sanitary Authorities) the city soon became relieved of the scourge. But the people who had fled did not return in any considerable numbers. Local trade continued in a bad way and it was this, apparently, which inspired the happy idea of a festival which should combine thanksgiving to the Joss with advertisement of the attractions of Macao as a place of residence and trade.

We are as little able to estimate the success of the advertisement as we are able to form an idea of the devotion and sentiments of the crowds which gathered in the streets to witness the great procession. The signs of devotion were certainly not obtrusive. The procession itself was one well worth seeing, but had it been better marshalled the pageant would have appeared much more imposing. The rain on Sunday morning delayed the starting of the procession by a couple of hours, but towards midday the weather improved and the sun shone fiercely in the afternoon. Starting from the waterfront of the Inner Harbour the procession made a tour of the principal thoroughfares of the city. The dense crowds in the narrow streets made progress very difficult and slow and the view fitful to those who were unable to see it from an elevated position. It was when the procession debouched on to the Praya Grande that the best view of it was obtainable, but as it came straggling along in sections, the spectacle lost something of its magnificence and impressment.

To adequately describe the procession, a profound knowledge of Chinese ancient history and legendary lore is needed, and to that the writer can lay no claim. He has to fall back on the phrase that the spectacle must be seen to be properly appreciated. In the estimation of the Chinese crowd its most attractive feature evidently was the enormous dragon which had been brought from Fatsian. If the foreign spectator were asked by what feature of the procession he was most impressed, he—man or woman—would probably mention the great variety of picturesque costumes, male as well as female, and the exquisite specimens of Chinese embroidery work represented among the banners. In this respect at any rate the word magnificent can be used without exaggeration. A noteworthy feature of the procession was the number of little girls in it. Many were gorgeously arrayed and mounted on very small ponies; others forming groups of "living statuary" were carried on platforms by coolies; others again formed walking groups, distinctively attired in most picturesque costumes and other young ladies were astride of large paper cocks and other birds of good omen in the legendary lore of China. Of the many one retains a picture of many groups in all sorts of picturesque head-dress and robed in fine silks of many hues. One group, conspicuous among the rest, carried the ancient arms of Chinese warriors and marched behind a dragon before whom danced a man occasionally throwing into the air a large ball, which apparently served to draw the monster on when he had ceased gyrating before houses from which crackers were exploded. No attempt, however brief, at describing the procession would be complete if it did not mention the feature which is characteristic of all such Chinese displays—the noise! There were sonorous gongs, and clanging cymbals, blowers of trumpets and of horns and the squealing of the stringed instruments. To all this has to be added the noise of exploding crackers in the Chinese streets, but on the Praya the air was free from the fumes of sulphur.

In some of the Chinese streets the occupiers had decorated the fronts of their houses in a most tasteful manner with flowers, and here and there the streets were arched with those gaudy but picturesque structures which form an essential feature of every Chinese scheme of public decoration. One of the finest of these was erected not far from the steamer wharves, where also there were open shows. At night when these

structures were illuminated by many lights, and when delighted crowds were assembled to witness the plays the scene was most interesting. Sir Frederick Lugard visited Macao on Sunday to witness the procession.

HOUSE-BOY'S EXTRAORDINARY IMPUDENCE.

CHIEF JUSTICE'S RESIDENCE USED AS AN INN.

During the last few months the Chief Justice, Sir Francis Piggott, has been on holiday in Japan, and during his absence it occurred to his No. 1 boy, who is in charge of "The Eyrie," that he might considerably increase his earnings by turning the grounds of the judicial residence into an open air restaurant. On Tuesday local Chinese celebrated the Chung Yuen festival, quite a number of them ascending the highest points of the Peak as is customary on this occasion. En route their attention was attracted by notices which had been pasted round the fence of Sir Francis Piggott's residence to the effect that there was a shop inside at which could be obtained coffee, milk, tea and meals at all hours; also cool water, etc. Seven large tables were laid on the lawn in front of the house, at which visitors were seated, while the cooking was carried out in the kitchen. The No. 1 had provided a special staff of waiters to attend to customers, and it would appear that these were busily engaged when Police Sergeant Gordon called, and was very considerably surprised to witness the garden party on his Lordship's lawn. Knowing that the family were absent from the Colony, it occurred to him that they could not be entertaining Chinese, so he proceeded to make inquiries which resulted on the arrest of the No. 1 boy, who was charged before Mr. F. A. Hazeland at the Police Court yesterday with keeping a common eating house at the Chief Justice's residence. Chan admitted the charge, and his Worship adjourned the case until the return of His Honour to the Colony.

THE SWATOW REFORMER.

ANOTHER PETITION FROM THE STRAITS.

Mr. Otto Kong Sing, solicitor, has received a petition signed by sixty Chinese merchants in Singapore and Johore which is to be presented to His Excellency the Governor in the event of the appeal against Mr. Hazeland's decision regarding the extradition of Ju Kai-shing being confirmed. Formerly Ju Kai-shing was a merchant in Singapore and Johore, and it will be remembered proceedings for his extradition were taken in the Police Court by the Chinese Government on a charge of armed robbery within the jurisdiction of China. The proceedings against the prisoner, according to the petitioners, are connected with the rebellion in South China, and they further state that the Chinese Government has preferred the charge of armed robbery against him in order to secure his extradition.

KULANGSU (AMOY) MUNICIPAL COUNCIL.

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held at the Board Room on the 24th September 1907.

Present:—Messrs. W. N. Wallace (Chairman), C. A. V. Bowra, A. F. Gardiner, Nuang Tsau-chew, W. Kruse, W. Wilson, the Health Officer and the Secretary.

1 The minutes of the last meeting are read and confirmed.

2 The Superintendent of Police reports the following cases have been dealt with at the Mixed Court since the last meeting:—

SUMMONSES.

Breach of Municipal Regulations 5, Assault 2, Debt 3, Contempt of Court 2, Allowing pigs to stray 5, Illegally removing stones 1.

SUMMARY ARRESTS.

Committing a nuisance 5, Theft 5, Obstruction 1, Assault 6, Contempt of Court 1, Removing material from the public roads 1.

(Signed) W. N. WALLACE,
Chairman,

By order,

C. BERKELEY MITCHELL,
Secretary.

SUPREME COURT.

Friday, October 18th.

IN SUMMARY JURISDICTION.

BEFORE MR. A. G. WISE (ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE).

"IN THE SAME BOAT."

Mr. W. F. Dixon of Messrs. Hastings and Hastings appeared for the plaintiff in an action for \$1,000 and stated that the plaintiff and the defendant were quartermasters on the *Empress of India*. That vessel sailed on Thursday and he asked that defendant be ordered to find security.

Mr. Grist, who appeared for the defendant, objected. Both were on the same steamer.

His Honour—Both had better give security.

Mr. Dixon said he was willing to give security for costs but he asked that defendant should give security for judgment and costs.

His Honour—You are both in the same boat?

Mr. Dixon—Defendant won't come back when there is a claim for \$1,000.

Mr. Grist—It is only a claim, my Lord. It is not judgment. He'll come back.

Adjourned.

A LOST PAIR OF TROUSERS.

F. Blunck sued the Connaught Hotel for \$12, the value of a pair of trousers. Mr. R. A. Harding appeared for the defence and stated that plaintiff was bringing an action for the recovery of \$12, the value of a pair of pongee silk trousers which was lost. The trousers were given to a laundryman who failed to return them. In the plaintiff's room as in every bedroom in the hotel there was a notice to the effect that "the hotel does not undertake a visitor's washing but if desired the bedroom boy will send for a washerman." The defence was that they had nothing to do with the trousers.

Plaintiff entered the box and stated that the pongee silk trousers cost more than he claimed. When he gave them to the washerman the boy said that he was the hotel washerman. When the clothes were returned he found that instead of his trousers there was a pair of workman's trousers which he would not wear.

His Honour—You can read?

Plaintiff—Yes, Sir.

His Honour—Is that (pointing to notice) in your room?

Plaintiff—I never saw it.

Mr. Harding—You never saw that in your room?

Plaintiff—I never saw one in my bedroom. I have been there six months.

Mr. Harding—You mean to say that one of these notices was not in your room?

Plaintiff—It was not in my room.

His Honour—Did you pick out a room without this notice?

Plaintiff—There is a notice about gas being charged after a certain hour.

His Honour—Did the boy tell you that the hotel did the washing?

Plaintiff—Yes, Sir.

Cross-examined by Mr. Harding. Do you say this hotel has a laundry?—No, I don't say that. They employ a laundryman.

Did you tell the boy you wanted a laundryman?—I did not tell him. He told me.

He told you that if you wanted a laundryman he could get one?—He recommended the hotel laundryman.

You agreed to employ him?—Yes.

And the laundryman came for the things each week?—The boy took the things out each time.

When the account was presented you handed the amount of the bill to the boy?—Oh, no.

When was this lost?—I gave the clothes on the 23rd June and they were returned on the 28th.

Plaintiff added that when he found there was a pair of trousers not his own he complained to the manager who promised that the amount should be deducted from his bill. That was said in the presence of the runner.

His Honour—Do you wish to subpoena this man?

Plaintiff—Yes.

His Honour—Well the case is adjourned till next Friday.

ALLEGED FORGED CHOPS.

The part heard case was concluded in which Lam Wing, as endorsee of Hau Kee, sued the Po Sang firm to recover the sum of \$500 84, amount of principal and interest due under a promissory note for \$500 made by the defendant firm on August 21st, and payable to Hau Kee on demand. In the alternative the plaintiff claimed as assignee \$500, for money lent to the defendant firm.

Mr. R. Harding appeared for the plaintiff, and Mr. R. A. Harding for the defendant.

His Honour said he was not in a position to decide whether the chops were forged by the plaintiff himself, but there could be no doubt that there were two sets of chops either used by Mui Hing with the connivance of his foks to deceive outsiders or by the late partner who had severed his connection with the firm. In the circumstances he gave judgment for defendant.

On leaving the Court the plaintiff and three witnesses were arrested on a warrant.

Monday, October 21st.

IN CRIMINAL JURISDICTION.

BEFORE MR. A. G. WISE (ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE).

THE TRIAL OF ADSETTS.

Curiosity attracted a large crowd to the Supreme Court to-day, when the Criminal Sessions opened and Adsetts was arraigned on the capital charge. Before the hour of ten struck, a large crowd held the footpath before the Court House. At ten Adsetts, who was brought from the Central Station in a chair, was escorted to the dock by two policemen who seated themselves one on each side of him. When the Deputy-Registrar charged William Hall Adsetts with on August 4th feloniously, wilfully and of his malice aforethought, killing and murdering Gertrude Dayton, and asked the prisoner how he pleaded, he replied "not guilty." The Attorney-General, Hon. Mr. W. Rees Davies, instructed by Mr. G. E. Morrell, of the Crown Solicitor's office, prosecuted, and Sir Henry Berkeley, K.C., instructed by Mr. R. Harding appeared for the accused.

The special jurors were:—E. A. Ram (foreman), C. W. May, D. W. Craddock, J. Barton, A. Turner, H. P. White and G. L. Tomlin.

The Attorney-General, in opening informed his Lordship and the jury that the prisoner at the bar was before the Court on an information charging him with the murder of a woman named Gertrude Dayton. The details of the crime were most revolting, and disclosed circumstances which he might say were almost unparalleled in the annals of crime. It would be idle to suppose that all Hongkong, indeed he might say all the Far East, were not familiar with the details of the tragedy, but it was his duty to ask the jurors, sitting as a jury on a capital charge, to banish from their minds any preconceived ideas which they might have formed of the case. They should study the evidence put before them, and on that evidence find their verdict. The prisoner was a citizen of the United States of America, and until recently had been staying at Manila. The deceased was also an American, and belonged to the demi-monde. The prisoner and deceased left Manila by the s.s. *Eastern* on July 3rd, and travelled together apparently as husband and wife under the names of Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Jones. The ship arrived here on August 3rd, and was met in the ordinary course of affairs by the runner from the Hongkong Hotel who brought them ashore together with two other passengers. This was at about eleven o'clock in the morning and they went to the Hongkong Hotel. The prisoner went to the office, and registered the names Mr. and Mrs. Jones, and they were assigned room No. 184, which was on the top floor. The prisoner and the deceased were seen to go to the room by two boys, and the woman gave some soiled clothing to one boy to be washed. Needless to say the movements of these people were not watched, but they were seen to enter their room, where they remained until about a quarter to ten at night. Then they were seen to go down in the lift, and it appeared that they proceeded to house No. 52, Hollywood Road commonly known as No. 12. The landlady of

this house was well known to the deceased woman, and she would state what occurred at her place. They arrived at this house about ten o'clock and stayed there for about an hour and a half or two hours. During that time they had several drinks in the shape of pints of champagne. The deceased woman signed chits for these drinks, but the landlady tore them up for reasons she would recite. The deceased also offered Mrs. Hempstead, the landlady, some Post Office Orders requesting her to cash them. They were produced from prisoner's pocket, but were not accepted by Mrs. Hempstead. The prisoner and deceased were next seen at 8, Hollywood Road, where it was presumed they went from No. 52. Miss Leavitt, a friend of the deceased woman, would speak to seeing them. They stayed at this house about half an hour and had two pints of champagne, leaving about two o'clock. The deceased signed a chit for drinks at this house and it would be produced in evidence. After leaving this house the woman was not seen alive again. Neither of the women at 52 or 18 definitely identified the accused but said he was an American. When they heard these witnesses describe the prisoner's appearance he did not think the jurors would have any doubt in arriving at the conclusion that he was the man in the company of the deceased at the two houses. At six o'clock on the morning of the 4th the man was seen at the door of his room in the hotel by a boy, who would also say that he saw him again at eight o'clock. The man told the boy not to enter the room as his wife was asleep. At about 6.30 that morning, presumably after the boy had first seen him, the prisoner went to 113, Wanchai Road, and bought a camphorwood trunk for which he paid \$9.15. The carpenter who sold the trunk absolutely identified the prisoner, and there was no doubt that he was the man who bought the trunk and took it in a ricksha to the Hongkong Hotel. At about eleven o'clock the same morning the accused rang the bell of his room and told the room boy to get two coolies to carry a box. This was done and two hotel coolies carried a Saratoga trunk down in the lift. The Attorney-General asked the jurors to bear in mind that the Saratoga trunk was different altogether from the one the accused purchased at 113 Wanchai Road. Below, accused gave instructions that two outside coolies should be called to take the trunk to Messrs. Butterfield and Swire's. These coolies were procured, and the prisoner accompanied the box to Messrs. Butterfield and Swire's shipping office. There it would be proved that a man described as an American had an interview with the shipping clerk. The shipping clerk could not identify the accused, but the man who called there asked to have the trunk sent to Hoikow by a ship sailing the next day. He asked if the box could be sent off at once, but was told by the clerk that it would go off in due course. The man gave the name of F. Jackson, and said the box was to be sent to A. H. Jacks. About an hour afterwards the accused returned and said he wished the box sent to Sydney, saying that the addressee would eventually go to Australia, and that it would be more convenient if the box was sent there. This was on Sunday, and the shipping clerk requested the man to return on Monday morning in ordinary office hours. The prisoner, after making two visits to the office in the course of the day, apparently mean to change his mind again, for in the afternoon between four and five o'clock, he came. When the street coolies near Pedder's Wharf became more swear to his identity—and took the trunk, and instructed the coolies by the face the bamboo wharf in front of No. 12. he put it aboard a sampan, which was manned by two women, and there was a man on board. One of the women, the prisoner who, when sampan owner, said the board directed them to a sampan on August 4th. wards to the *Monteagle* wait for him at the evidence not given by the two coolies carried a box he proposed to tender boat. The box was placed the two women and accused sat in the well got up, went to see they had started. Prisoner the mast, put over the portside of the sampan, hand as if to by his hand. He put it right Finding, appar, and it floated. Witness asked him it on board, the box in the water and he

remonstrated with him for nearly capsizing the boat. All the occupants had to get to starboard when the trunk was put over the port side. Having made this attempt, the accused instructed the two women to proceed to the *Monteagle*. If he had succeeded in sinking the trunk the ghastly discovery which was afterwards made might never have been effected. It was received on board about 6.30 p.m. by the quartermaster, who said the prisoner, whom he identified, requested that the trunk should be put in the hold. It was, however, put in the baggage room by direction of the officer. If the trunk had been put in the hold it was possible that the tragedy would not have been discovered at the early stage it was. The prisoner remained on board some 20 minutes, and left his victim's body in the trunk on the steamer. He landed in the same sampan at a stone wharf, and was identified as having on the following day gone to a pawn-brokers in Queen's Road and pawned two loose diamonds for \$25. He then signed the name H. Jones, Room 184, Hongkong Hotel. The theory for the prosecution was that those loose stones came from a ring belonging to deceased. On August 6th, the following day, the accused left the Colony by the *Tosa Maru*, having booked a first class passage to Shanghai under the name of Jackson. On August 7th the police were sent for on board the *Monteagle*, and from information received they proceeded to the baggage room. There the corpse of a woman was found in a Saratoga trunk and removed to the mortuary where the doctor held a postmortem examination. He found a lady's belt knotted firmly round the neck, and twisted tight with the assistance of a hair brush. There was also in the box two Hongkong Hotel towels, a man's night dress and a glove. The body was in such a state of decomposition that it was impossible to say what had caused death, but the medical opinion was that death could have been caused by strangulation by the band round the neck. No other possible cause could be found for the death. The body was duly buried, and the police removed the contents of Room 184. In it they found some luggage which was identified as part of the property of Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Jones. The mattress on the bed was found to be blood stained, presumably from bleeding from the mouth or nose, which the doctor would say might have been caused by strangulation. The mattress had been turned over, apparently to conceal the stains. Spots of blood were also found on the table close to the bed, and these had the appearance of finger marks. The camphor wood box was also in the room. With reference to that, the theory the Crown put forward was that the prisoner bought the box with the object of placing the body of his victim in it. Probably he found the box was not so suitable as he imagined, and selected the Saratoga trunk. A hat and suit of clothes were also found in the room, and the clothes were identified as those worn by the accused when he took the trunk on board the *Monteagle*. A hat and a quantity of clothing, identified as belonging to Gertrude Dayton, were also found. As a result of these discoveries telegrams were despatched by the police, and on August 13th the prisoner was arrested at Chefoo and taken to the United States Consulate there. He was found on his person a quantity of jewellery including a lady's watch, also a number of Post Office Orders. Nearly all this jewellery was identified by Miss Josie Marshall, who arrived in the Colony from Manila on August 9th. This woman was an old friend of the deceased, and knew all about her belongings. The prisoner was afterwards shipped on board the U. S. cruiser *Galveston* to Manila, and as a result of extradition proceedings he was brought here under arrest. The woman, Josie Marshall, knew Gertrude Dayton and the prisoner, and she saw them together at Manila, and would speak of their leaving on July 31st. When Miss Marshall arrived here she was taken to the cemetery, and she identified the body of the deceased, which was exhumed for that purpose. She also identified all, or practically all jewellery found on the prisoner, as being the property of the deceased. The P. O. Orders to which Council referred as being found on the prisoner were payable to Mrs. Margaret Hupper who, Miss Marshall would

the sister of the deceased woman, and she believed, lived in Ohio, U.S.A. Such were the details he had to unfold of this ghastly tragedy, the motive for which apparently was clear. It was perhaps a sordid action, as could be easily imagined. The unfortunate woman was strangled to death purely for the purpose of plunder. He would not hazard a guess as to the lines of the defence. The prisoner had the advantage of the inestimable services of his learned friend, Sir Henry Berkeley who would lay before the jury everything that could possibly be said on his client's behalf, and Counsel invited jurors' close attention to the evidence as a whole, and if it appeared that the facts were as he had detailed them, then there was only one verdict it was possible to bring in. The law of most civilized countries determined that for murder there was one punishment only. Regarding that punishment, it was the duty of the jury to investigate the case as a whole, and unless some defence of a practical character was put before them; unless his learned friend in the exercise of his ingenuity created some doubt in their minds, then it was their duty to find the prisoner guilty of one of the foulest and basest murders that ever stained the annals of crime in any country.

J. H. Oxberry was the first witness. He said he was a runner employed in the Hongkong Hotel. On August 3rd he went aboard the s.s. *Eastern* from Australia via Manila. He brought four passengers ashore, one a Mr. Ross, and other two were Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Jones. Witness identified Adsetts as Mr. Jones. When witness took the passengers to the hotel he saw the accused book a room for Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Jones. Witness previously saw prisoner here last year. He was then on the s.s. *Taming*. The book produced, was the Hongkong Hotel launch book.

Cross-examined—Witness was speaking from memory as to the identity of the prisoner. He brought four passengers ashore on the day in question, but could only remember the names of three. He saw Jones register at the Hotel, but did not inform the manager that he had registered under a wrong name. Witness brought from 35 to 40 passengers ashore to the Hongkong Hotel a week, but he was not prepared to recognise all of them.

R. Soonderam, sworn, said he was a counter clerk employed by the Hongkong Hotel Co. On the morning the s.s. *Eastern* arrived one of the passengers entered the office and registered the names of Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Jones. Witness assigned him Room 184. [The Hotel register was produced, and witness pointed out the signature of Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Jones. Witness failed to identify the prisoner as the man who had registered at the Hotel.

Cross-examined—The man who registered as W. H. Jones was not accompanied by a lady. It was a fact that witness failed to identify the prisoner, and picked out another man.

A. R. Soonderam, another counter clerk employed by the Hongkong Hotel Co., said he knew the accused, whom he saw at the Hongkong Hotel on August 4th. Accused then asked him for a loan of \$10. Witness asked him his name and the room he occupied. Witness then gave him a chit to sign for the money; he compared the signature with the signature in the register and then handed over the money. It was customary to advance small loans to boarders. After receiving the money accused told witness to get him two outside coolies. He wanted them to carry a sample case to a certain firm, and would go with them. Witness did not see the sample case, but he was sure the prisoner was the man to whom he advanced the money. To the best of his knowledge the chit had not been met.

Cross-examined—Witness had never seen the person for whom he got the coolies before. He recognised the prisoner, but could not say how many persons he advanced money to at the Hotel.

May Hempstead, who resides at 52, Hollywood Road testified to knowing Gertrude Dayton. On August 3rd she called at witness' house, accompanied by a man, about ten or half past ten. She had never seen the man who accompanied her before. He was about 28 or 29 years of age and clean shaven. When Miss Dayton entered the house she said—"I feel tipsy." She introduced the man with her as Jones, but said it was not his proper name.

The visitors stayed at her house for about two hours, and had nine pints of champagne, for which Gertrude Dayton gave a chit. Witness tore it up after she heard of the woman's death, as she did not wish to be mixed up in the affair. She saw the Post Office Orders which the man produced, but did not have them in her hands. The deceased was wearing some rings the night she was at witness' house.

Cross-examined—Gertrude wanted to borrow money on a Post Office Order. She asked the man with her to give her the Orders. Witness could not recognise the prisoner.

By the Court—When the woman arrived she said she was tipsy. Did she appear tipsy to you?—Yes.

And when they left the house after the champagne did she appear tipsy?—She appeared all right.

The Attorney-General—I have just had a medical certificate put in by Miss Leavitt stating that she is unable to attend. I require her attendance, and do not consider a certificate signed by a doctor is sufficient.

His Lordship—There is another course: take the doctor's evidence.

Chun Wo identified Adsetts as having bought a box at his shop on 4th August and tendered an American gold coin in payment.

Cross-examined—He remained a short time in the shop, paid for the box, and went away in a ricksha. On 25th September he identified the prisoner. He had never seen him before 4th August. Asked if he could recognise all the Europeans who came to his shop between 4th August and 25th September, he replied that there were few Europeans who came to his shop. He could not recognise them unless they were taken to the Police Station. Witness identified the box he made because it had two small holes.

Re-examined—The box was made by another carpenter but he fixed the hinges.

Yeung Cheung, room boy at the Hongkong Hotel, said Room 18 was under his charge. He remembered 3rd August last on which day two Europeans occupied the room. He saw the man and the woman enter the room about 11 o'clock. He recognised prisoner as the man. On the following day he saw the man after 11 o'clock a.m. Witness went up to the Room 184 in response to the bell, and prisoner told him to get two coolies to take a box below. Witness saw no one in the room besides prisoner. He told the coolies and they went up to the room. While in the room he had noticed the trunk produced in court. That day witness noticed that two towels were missing from the room. The place where he slept was close to Room 184.

Cross-examined—He had no conversation with the man on 3rd August, and on the 4th the only conversation he had with him was with regard to sending up the coolies. The next time he saw prisoner was on 25th Sept., when he identified him. He had never seen the man before 3rd August.

Re-examined—He identified prisoner on the 25th September from among a number of other men.

Wong Cheong, room boy at the Hongkong Hotel, said he worked with the last witness on the same flat. He remembered a man and a woman coming to Room 184 on 3rd August because he was given some dirty clothing by the woman to have washed. He entered the room and saw a man, the one who came with her at 11 o'clock. About 4 o'clock that day he was asked to make tea, and on taking it to the room saw both the man and the woman there. About a quarter to ten that night he saw the couple go up by lift, enter the room where they remained for a quarter of an hour, and then went out. He did not see them again that night. Next morning at 6 o'clock he saw the man standing outside Room 184. He was fully dressed. Witness saw him again at 8 o'clock leave the room and pass him. Prisoner made a statement to him.

The Attorney-General submitted that the statement made by the prisoner to witness was evidence provided the Court was satisfied that the witness identified the man.

His Honour—I am not satisfied.

Witness then spoke to seeing the box produced in the room on August 3rd.

Cross-examined—Most of the visitors to the hotel had Saratoga trunks like that.

What other rooms had occupants on August 3rd?—It is a long time ago. I cannot remember.

You have told us the movements of the occupants of Room 184, when they had tea and so on? Can you tell me the movements of Room 179?—No.

Let me look at your watch?—I have not got one.

I thought you had from the particularity with which you gave the times of prisoner's movements. Can you identify the man who occupied Room 184?—No, he was a man of about the height of prisoner.

Li Sing Hing, baggage clerk at the Hongkong Hotel, deposed to having certain baggage taken up to Room 184, and produced his book giving details of the baggage. All the articles except the camphorwood box he recognised.

Cross-examined—He was unable to identify the accused as the man who registered as W. H. Jones.

Chun Leung, house coolie in the Hongkong Hotel, spoke to having taken luggage to Room 184 on August 3rd. He identified the articles produced. The camphorwood box was not taken up till next day. He took the trunk from Room 184 to the lift where the boarder took it in charge.

Cross-examined—He was taken to the Police Station on 25th September but failed to identify the prisoner. He was able to identify him better now. He was constantly taking boxes and trunks, like those.

Yip Sai, house coolie at the Hongkong Hotel, who assisted the previous witness to carry the luggage, gave corroborative evidence.

Lai Lok, hall porter at the Hongkong Hotel, who gave instructions on August 4th to two coolies to carry a box for a visitor from the hotel to Butterfield and Swire's, said he saw the boarder leave with the coolies.

Can you identify the man?—Slightly.

Is he in court?—Yes.

Where?—Prisoner.

What do you mean by slightly?—He was there for about a week and I only saw him once. Then the police came and made inquiries.

What do you mean by slightly?—I only saw him once.

Are you sure this is the man?—I only saw him once but he talked to me and I think I remember him.

Lo Yau, coolie, said that on 4th August he was engaged by a clerk in the Hongkong Hotel to carry, with another coolie, a box from there to the office of Butterfield and Swire. A European accompanied them. The box he carried was something like that produced. The European was the prisoner. He paid them 2 cents each. Witness identified prisoner at the gaol on September 5th.

Cross-examined—He was often asked to carry luggage to and from the Hongkong Hotel. If the people from the hotel were not able to carry the luggage themselves they asked him.

Could you identify people for whom you carried luggage like this six weeks afterwards?—Sometimes.

After tiffin Chan Tsoi was called. He said he was a street coolie, and remembered being at Blake Pier on August 4th. A European, who was there in a ricksha, asked witness to get two coolies for him, and he and his foki followed the European to Butterfield and Swire's. There they got a box which was lying at the foot of the staircase. They carried it to the bamboo wharf and put it on a sampan. The European followed them. The box in court was the one they carried. Witness did not know the European before and could not identify him.

H. W. Kent, shipping clerk in Messrs. Butterfield and Swire's, testified to being in his office on Sunday August 4th. About ten that morning a man called at the office and said he wanted to send a box to Hoihow.

Sir Henry Berkeley objected to conversation going in as evidence.

Witness, proceeding, said he was not in a position to identify the man who called with the box. This man had a conversation with witness and then went away, returning an hour afterwards. They had a further conversation. The man did not remain more than five minutes on his second visit, and when he left the box was still there. Witness issued the ordinary parcel receipt for the box, and when he returned to the office on the following morning the box was not

there. A Chinese shipping clerk handed him the parcel receipt on Monday morning.

Sir Henry Berkeley objected to this evidence.

The Attorney-General—We have evidence to prove the fact that the prisoner engaged certain coolies to carry the box to Messrs. Butterfield and Swire's, and I propose to get in evidence what took place there. I submit that what took place between a certain individual—whether he can identify the prisoner or not—and the prisoner, is evidence.

His Lordship—I take it that I should tell the jury, after considering the whole of the evidence, that if they come to the conclusion that it is probable the man who went there was the prisoner, they can do so.

Sir Henry Berkeley—In the meantime, unless the witness can identify the prisoner as the man with whom he had the conversation, it is not evidence.

The Attorney-General—The effect of my learned friend's suggestion would be to shut out material evidence as to what took place. I have a group of witnesses who will identify the prisoner as the man who had the trunk taken to Messrs. Butterfield and Swire. I want now to get from this witness what actually took place there.

His Lordship—I take it he won't identify him?

Sir Henry Berkeley—He does not.

His Lordship—I don't think it's worth while going into that conversation.

The Attorney-General—I am only anxious to put the jury in possession of all the facts so far as we know them.

Sir Henry Berkeley—I would like your Lordship to make a formal note of my objection that a shipping receipt given to one F. Jackson, by this witness, is not receivable in evidence unless the witness can swear that the prisoner is Jackson, and the witness declares his inability to identify the prisoner with the man Jackson, to whom the note was given. I don't press my objection just now because my learned friend has been arguing to you that W. H. Jones went to Butterfield and Swire's, and the persons who took the parcel swear to the prisoner being W. H. Jones, but it appears that the shipping receipt was given to a man named Jackson. There is no evidence before the Court, and no one knew the prisoner as Jackson, consequently there is no evidence to connect W. H. Jones and Jackson.

His Lordship—That is the reason I am allowing it.

Sir Henry Berkeley—If you tell the jury that I will be quite satisfied.

The Attorney-General—If your Lordship is going to regard the point raised by my learned friend I should like to add something.

His Lordship—I have overruled his objection. Wong Kau, declared, said he was at Pedder's Wharf on August 4th, and was then called by a European, the prisoner. They went to the office of Messrs. Butterfield and Swire where they got a box the accused pointed out to them, and carried it to the bamboo wharf. The box in Court was the one they carried. They put the box aboard a sampan, and prisoner went on board with it. At the jail witness picked out the prisoner at once.

Cross-examined—Witness was taken to the jail on 25th September. He had never seen the European before the day he saw him at Butterfield and Swire's.

H. W. Kent recalled, in reply to Sir Henry Berkeley, said the box he saw had labels on it.

Lolita Leavitt said she lived at 44, Lyndhurst Terrace, and on August 3rd was living at 18, Hollywood Road. She knew the deceased slightly. On August 4th deceased called on witness at 18, Hollywood Road. There was a man with her, and witness took him to be an American. She did not know him before. The pair stayed in the house from twenty minutes to half an hour, during which time they had two pints of champagne. The man who accompanied deceased appeared young, and she thought was clean shaven. She could not see any resemblance between prisoner and the man who called at her house. She did not know what the person looked like who called at her house. Miss Dayton gave witness a chit for the two bottles of champagne. Deceased was wearing some rings that night. She also wore a blue skirt, a blouse and a small jacket.

Cross-examined—Witness was taken to the jail and asked if she could pick out the man, but she could not.

H. Macfarlane, medical officer in charge of the Public mortuary at Kowloon, remembered a trunk being taken to the mortuary on August 7th. It was opened in the presence of witness and Inspector Hanson, and other police officers were present. The trunk contained the body of an adult female. The legs were bent on the thighs and the thighs on the abdomen. The head could not at first be seen, as it was in the bottom of the box and hidden by the arms. The body was very much swollen by decomposition. A blue waist belt was firmly knotted round the neck, and a hair brush had been inserted under this and given one complete turn. Assuming the woman to be in a state of intoxication and with the band round her neck as described, it could have caused instantaneous unconsciousness and subsequently death.

On the assumption that the woman had been strangled would you expect to find blood on any part of the body?—Blood might flow from the nose, ears and mouth.

Proceeding witness said when he examined the body at the cemetery a woman named Josie Marshall was present. Self inflicted strangulation by mechanical means like a brush or a stick was very rare.

Sir Henry Berkeley—But not impossible?—No.

There were no marks of violence about the throat?—I didn't see any.

Isn't it the opinion of medical jurists that in the absence of external marks of violence the presumption is suicidal strangulation?—Yes.

Is it not also the presumption that a person bent on suicide takes the nearest article to hand?—Yes.

And is it not a fact that the article round deceased's neck was a waistband?—Yes.

And there's nothing in the appearance of the band round the neck or the knots, inconsistent with suicide?—No.

Is the habit of indulging in excessive drink likely or not to cause suicidal tendencies in women?—I don't think it necessarily causes them to commit suicide.

Does it not affect the nervous system?—Yes. Do persons under the influence of drink very frequently commit suicide?—I don't think so.

Proceeding, witness said the body was exhumed eight days after it left the Mortuary. Josie Marshall walked right up to the body looked at it and came back. Witness thought she would rather not have entered, and she did not stay long, as she could not stand the smell.

And you can stand the smell?—Yes, I'm accustomed to it.

Will you swear that the box is the one out of which the body came?—No.

The Attorney-General—On the assumption that this was a case of suicide, some time I take it would elapse before blood would issue from the mouth or nostrils?—It would depend on what violence was used.

Would it have been possible for deceased to have put her hand out on to the table and left bloodstains?—No, I think she would have become unconscious immediately.

His Lordship—Could anyone knowing the deceased before, find it easier to identify the body after exhumation in consequence of the swelling having gone down?—Yes.

Sir Henry Berkeley—Do you mean to say that a face in that state could have been recognised by a person anywhere?—When the swelling goes down the features become more noticeable.

Do you mean to say that after eight days the body could have been recognised by the face alone?—I think it just possible.

Only just possible?—Yes.

In other words very unlikely?—I should say it is unlikely.

Fung Yee, licensed sampan owner, said the prisoner engaged her sampan on August 4th. He told her to go and wait for him at the bamboo wharf, where two coolies carried a box and put it aboard her boat. The box was placed on board amidships and accused sat in the well of the sampan after they had started. Prisoner put the trunk over the port side of the sampan, holding on to it by his hand. He put it right into the water, and it floated. Witness asked him why he put the box in the water and he

replied—"Shut up." Afterwards he put the box back and told witness to go alongside a steamer with four masts. When the accused put the box overboard they were in the centre of the harbour. Prisoner paid witness \$2 for her work. This was not the usual fare, but part was *cumsha*.

Cross-examined—When before the magistrate she had not said anything about the European having put the trunk overboard.

Why didn't you mention it then?—I was asked to tell the truth now.

You were asked to tell the truth then?—Yes I was confused. I was frightened.

Who taught you to tell the truth afterward?—I remembered the truth and so I am telling the truth.

You must be a very forgetful woman when as you say your sampan was nearly capsized you did not remember, yet you remember the man six weeks afterwards?—My gall is small.

The Interpreter—That is to say, She has no courage.

Sir Henry Berkeley—We don't want any courage. I suggest this was manufactured by you subsequently.

You have carried many Europeans since. Are you able to recognise them all?—No, as soon as they pay me there is an end of it.

Chan Sam, mother-in-law of the last witness and joint owner of the sampan was called. She was a fresh witness. She spoke to a European being taken on board the sampan. She was not able to identify him as her sight was not good but the prisoner looked like him. The European told them to row to Wanchai and in mid stream the man suddenly threw the box overboard. Then he placed his hand upon and afterwards pulled it on board again, almost capsizing the boat. Afterwards he asked them to take him to the four-masted steamer, which he boarded. Soon two Chinese came and took the box on board the steamer. Prisoner came back to the boat and they rowed him ashore.

Cross-examined—Her daughter did not give that evidence about throwing the box overboard because she was frightened.

Sir Henry Berkeley—Can you see me?

His Honour—Would you recognise him again?

Witness—I might recognise you again to a certain extent (laughter).

Sir Henry Berkeley—Your eyesight is defective?—Yes.

And you pretend to recognise this man?—I look at him carefully and his face looks like the man who engaged my boat.

Did this European have a beard?—No.

The prisoner has got a beard?—Yes, a little.

The hearing was adjourned.

Tuesday, October 22nd.

William Hall Adsetts again appeared before the Court to answer the charge of wilfully murdering Gertrude Dayton in this Colony on August 4th. The Court House, as on the previous day, was filled with spectators. As before the Attorney-General, Hon. Mr. W. Ree-Davies, instructed by Mr. G. E. Morrell, from the Crown Solicitor's office, prosecuted, and Sir Henry Berkeley, K.C., instructed by Mr. R. Harding, appeared for the accused.

The special jurors were:—E. A. Ram (foreman), C. W. May, D. W. Craddock, J. Barton, A. Turner, H. P. White and G. L. Tomlin.

Frank Browne, Government Analyst, was the next witness. On August 19th Detective Sergeant Sullivan gave him three bottles, the contents of which he examined. Two contained oxide of hydrogen, and one a hair wash. Previous to this, on August 14th, witness received three other articles. One, a piece of mattress, contained blood stains which were comparatively recent. On the table cover produced witness also found blood stains which might be finger marks. Witness also received some sealed bottles of post-mortem materials, but found no trace of poison.

Cross-examined—What do you mean to convey by the words "comparatively recent date"?—Anytime between a few days and under two months.

You say that blood stains may have been made two months before your examination?—Yes.

Is there any means for your determining whether the blood, supposing it came from a

woman, is blood caused by violence or such blood as comes in the ordinary course?—I can't say.

J. H. Oxberry, recalled, in reply to Sir Henry Berkeley, said he first saw the prisoner after bringing him ashore at Hongkong, on his entering the Court at Manila.

He was then in charge of a constable?—Yes, in plain clothes.

I put it to you that you identified him because you saw him in Court as an accused person?—No, I didn't.

Unconsciously, or sub-consciously you recognised him?—He came into Court as any ordinary person.

Were you present when Soonderam identified him?—I was.

When Soonderam identified him was the prisoner not sitting beside the lawyer defending him?—Yes.

The Attorney-General—I think you said you saw him twelve months ago?—Yes, on the "Taming." He was then in the uniform of a sergeant of American Marines.

J. J. Lyons said he was on August 13th quartermaster on the s.s. "Monteagle." On August 4th, Sunday, he was on watch on the main gangway, and saw a man coming out of the passengers cabin. The prisoner was that man. Witness asked him who he wished to see. He said he had a trunk on a sampan which he wished taken on board. Witness told him to let the sampan drop to the after gangway, and told the boatswain to send three men there. When witness went aft the trunk was on board, and in reply to the second officer witness said it belonged to the accused, who was standing there. Prisoner told witness he wished the trunk put in the hold. The trunk in Court looked much like the one he saw on board. Witness went to the jail the day he was sent to identify the prisoner. He saw him there and identified him.

Cross-examined—Witness did not take notice of the clothes the man was wearing at the identification. He did not go to identify his clothes, but his features.

What's the colour of his eyes?—I don't know.

I don't think your identification seems to be very reliable. Was the prisoner not two inches taller than those amongst whom he was placed?—I could not say; they were not standing up.

You only went to pick out the man, I see, and found him?—I found him.

As a matter of fact was not the prisoner in a dirty condition, made conspicuous by the fact that he was dirtier and taller than those he was placed amongst?—I don't know what you mean. What you call dirty and what I call dirty may be different altogether.

You told me just now you didn't know the colour of his eyes. Did you go to see the shape of his nose?—I know that pretty well.

What sort of nose has he?—Much the same as mine, very prominent.

Li Cho, accountant in a pawnshop at 75, Queen's Road Central, said the prisoner called at his shop and pawned diamonds on which witness advanced \$55. Prisoner wrote his name and address on a piece of paper which witness wrapped his diamonds in and kept. At the jail witness identified the accused.

Cross-examined—I put it to you that you remember the fact of advancing a sum of money on the pledge of a diamond, but you are not able to recognise the person to whom you made the advance?—I am able to identify him.

Why did you say at this Court first that you could not identify him?—I meant I did not know his nationality.

Between 25th September and August 4th did you not have other Europeans in your shop?—Yes.

And to pawn diamonds?—Yes.

Why were you unwilling to admit that Europeans had pawned diamonds with you since August 4th?—I said yes.

I put it to you that you are not able to identify the other Europeans who called at your shop?—No.

You identified the prisoner at the jail?—Yes.

He was then dirtier than the others?—They were all in about the same condition.

Li Fuk, who was present at the shop of the last witness on August 5th, spoke to seeing the

prisoner there and acting as interpreter when he wished to pawn some diamonds. He recognised the prisoner by his gold teeth, which the latter said were made in America and cost him \$100.

Cross-examined—You were employed on an American ship, and took the prisoner to be an Englishman?—Yes.

The man who pawned the diamonds had speech to your ears, trained as they must have been to the American accent, like an Englishman?—He had an American accent.

You never saw him before August 4th?—No.

And then you saw him at the jail?—Yes.

And identified him?—Yes.

I put it to you you got your knowledge from Li Cho?—No.

You never spoke to him about the identification?—No.

Pardon me, but I find it difficult to believe that. Do you mean to say you and Li Cho did not speak about it?—I do not stay at the pawnshop, and he did not tell me about the identification.

The Attorney-General—You were asked whether you could discriminate between an Englishman and an American. Now what nationality do you think I am?—I don't know whether you are an Englishman or an American.

By the Court—All white men are alike to Chinese?—Yes, they are all white.

R. Soonderam, recalled, in reply to Sir Henry Berkeley, said he kept the Hotel register, when on duty. Room 184 was previously occupied on June 25th, and before that on June 19th. On the 13th of the same month the room was occupied by Mr. and Mrs. Hamilton Parish.

R. Sorensen, carpenter on board the s.s. "Monteagle," said on August 7th he detected a smell on board and saw blood coming from the baggage room. Witness went to the Chief Officer and got the keys of the baggage room, then he procured some tools and forced the trunk open. On discovering a body in it he went and reported the matter. The trunk he opened was similar to the one before the Court. The lock was forced open in the same way as he forced the lock on board.

Sergeant George Watt testified to proceeding to the "Monteagle" on August 7th, and finding the body of a woman in a trunk in the baggage room. He had the trunk removed to the Kowloon Mortuary.

Cross-examined—Witness went with the box to the mortuary. The waistband before the court was soiled and discoloured when taken from the body after the exhumation. Miss Marshall looked at the body and said it was that of Gertrude Dayton.

Ben Fell said he was in the Consulate of the United States at Chefoo during the month of August. He knew the prisoner at the bar by the name of W. H. Adsetts. On August 13th witness saw the prisoner at Chefoo when he was arrested. He was searched a few minutes after entering the Consulate, and witness saw various articles taken from his person. The manicure set produced was taken from a bag. The name Gertrude was engraved on each article except one. The other articles of jewellery found on prisoner's person were also identified by witness. The articles taken from accused were mostly found in his trousers pockets. He said nothing while the search was being effected.

Cross-examined—Did you not find in the prisoner's bag certain papers of his release?—Yes, papers of his discharge from the marines. Among the prisoner's papers put in as exhibits was one recommending him to the good conduct medal should he re-enlist, and another from his captain regarding a certain act of gallantry in the Philippines. Adsetts arrived at the Chefoo Consulate in the Spring with a good record.

Is it not a fact that the prisoner authorised Consul General Fowler to inform the Government of Hongkong that he was ready and willing to surrender himself, if adequately defended?—Yes he made such a statement.

And the Consul sent a telegram to this Government to that effect?—I'm quite positive he did not.

Somebody did?—Yes.

You are acquainted with the law of extradition in the United States to some extent?—In a limited way.

None of us know the law except in a limited way, more or less. Does the law of America state that an American citizen cannot be extradited from a treaty port in China?

His Lordship—How about Jackson's case?

Sir Henry Berkeley—The American authorities at Chafoo have no power to take Adsetts away from Chafoo, is that not so?

The Attorney-General—I don't want to interrupt, but the question raised by my learned friend is totally irrelevant to the question of fact, which is one of murder.

Sir Henry Berkeley—My learned friend entirely misinterprets the object of my question. The prisoner is before the Court, and no matter how he came he is amenable to the jurisdiction of the Court. But I am going to put to the jury the conduct of the prisoner, which is in his favour. Being aware that he was in an asylum from which he could not be removed voluntarily, he came to this Court to face his trial. No American ship of war could take possession of an American citizen except by process of law, and no English captain of a man-of-war can arrest a British subject except by process of law.

The Attorney-General—I might tell my friend at once that if he is going to pursue that line I will have to re-examine witnesses to prove that the prisoner did not come here voluntarily.

Sir Henry Berkeley—Not after he wrote the letter.

The Attorney-General—No, not after writing the letter.

His Lordship (to Sir Henry Berkeley)—You don't intend to trouble the jury with much law?

Sir Henry Berkeley—No man can be deprived of his life except according to law.

His Lordship—If the jury find the facts proved they can find the prisoner guilty.

Sir Henry Berkeley—Quite so, but my question was to ascertain the conduct of the prisoner. A man may in a moment of panic, and fearful of the charge made against him, flee from justice and endeavour to prevent apprehension to the last, and at last being taken may commit an act which the jury must consider fairly and impartially for what it is worth. I will draw your Lordship's attention to Moore on Extradition.

His Lordship—All this will come in your address to the jury. It comes in rather awkwardly now in the middle of the evidence.

Sir Henry Berkeley—As your Lordship pleases.

May Hempstead, recalled, in reply to Sir Henry Berkeley, said she did not know anything about the relations between Gertrude Dayton and B. Booth. Gertrude said she had come away from Manila with insurance money she had collected belonging to B. Booth. She also said she left Manila hurriedly. Witness did not know whether the Post Office Orders had any reference to that. Such knowledge she had she got from Dayton.

Are you aware that the prisoner had those postal orders with the consent of the woman Dayton?—I don't know anything about it.

The Attorney-General—Miss Dayton came to Hongkong from Manila owing to the unpleasantness between her and Miss Booth?—I believe that is so.

Josie Marshall was the first witness after tiffin. She said she arrived in Hongkong on August 9th, and now resided at 18, Hollywood Road. She knew Gertrude Dayton very well, having known her for about four years, during which time she lived in the States and China and Manila. Witness had known the prisoner since July last. She saw him at the Hotel Franco in Manila. She and Miss Dayton were staying at that hotel. Prisoner and deceased had been together in her company at Manila. Miss Dayton left Manila on the s.s. "Eastern" on July 31st, and prisoner left the same day. Witness arrived here on August 9th, and was taken to the cemetery on the 15th, where she saw Gertrude Dayton's body in the mortuary. She had no difficulty in identifying the body, the distinctive marks being her teeth, arms and fingers. When she identified the body, witness could not tell it by the features. Deceased had quite a lot of jewellery. [This was produced, and witness identified the greater part of it]. Witness had seen the two tickets produced before. They

were issued in the name of Mrs. E. C. Mayo which was supposed to be deceased's married name.

Cross-examined—You came to Hongkong expecting to find Miss Dayton here?—Yes.

You were told on arrival she was dead, and were taken to a body which was so decomposed that you could not identify the face?—No.

Being unable to identify the features you state you have no doubt the body was that of Dayton for three reasons: long fingers with pointed nails, gold filling in the teeth and large front teeth?—Yes.

I take it, Miss Marshall, that you know several young women with long fingers and pointed nails?—Yes.

And who have fine large front teeth?—Yes. And whose teeth are filled?—Yes.

Except for the fact of having seen a corpse with long fingers and pointed nails, gold filled and large front teeth, there was nothing to show that Miss Dayton ever came to Hongkong?—As far as I know.

Go back to the Post Office Orders. There were fifteen originally, were there not?—Yes.

And you had one?—Yes. And cashed it?—No.

Are these Post Office Orders proceeds of the insurance money?—Yes.

Proceeds of the money paid Miss Dayton by a fire insurance office in Manila?—Yes.

That was on a house belonging to B. Booth, was it not?—That I can't say. I don't know.

Weren't you summoned before the prosecuting attorney at Manila?—Yes.

What was the charge against you?—There was not one. He wanted to know what I knew about the affair.

Wasn't it alleged that Dayton received the insurance money on behalf of B. Booth and misappropriated it?—From what I understand Gertrude received the money and had an order to receive it.

Didn't she leave Manila because she was afraid of being prosecuted?—Yes.

The Attorney-General—Do you know B. Booth?—Yes.

Did Adsetts—Sir Henry Berkeley objected.

His Lordship—I have not heard the Attorney-General's question yet.

Sir Henry Berkeley—You've heard a quarter and that's quite enough.

His Lordship wished to hear the question.

The Attorney-General—Does Adsetts know B. Booth? There is some mystery attaching to the insurance transaction with Booth, and I want to know whether Adsetts is known to B. Booth.

Witness—I have not seen him talking to her, but I have heard him speak of her.

Francis Gomez, passenger clerk in the Nippon Yusen Kaisha, identified the prisoner as having booked a first class passage to Shanghai on August 5th under the name of Mr. Jackson. Witness identified the prisoner at the jail on September 30th.

Cross-examined—Witness booked many passengers this year and thought he could identify them all.

Detective Sergeant E. O'Sullivan gave evidence as to what was found in Room 184, Hongkong Hotel, when the police searched that room. Later he went to Manila for the prisoner, and brought him back to this colony. When witness saw the prisoner at Manila he was quite clean shaven.

Cross examined—The blood stain witness found on the bed of Room 184, was on the reverse side of the mattress.

P. P. J. Wodehouse, Assistant Superintendent of Police, said a number of the witnesses who had given evidence were taken to the prison to identify Adsetts, who was seated with ten other men. Witness explained the method of procedure, and gave the names of the witnesses who identified the prisoner.

Cross-examined—On the first occasion prisoner's dirty appearance was not very noticeable. On the second occasion it was more noticeable.

Chief Detective Inspector J. W. Hanson bore witness to examining Room 184 at the Hongkong Hotel, in company with Sergeant Sullivan, and spoke as to what they saw there. On the 24th September, the day after the prisoner's arrival here, witness charged him with the murder of Gertrude Dayton, cautioned him, and took the statement he made down in writing. It was—

"I wish to plead not guilty." There were three men at the jail for the purpose of identification who were taller than the prisoner.

This closed the case for the Crown, and Counsel for the defence said the prisoner desired to be called.

William Hall Adsetts then entered the witness box and was sworn.

Sir Henry Berkeley—You are charged with the wilful murder of Gertrude Dayton. You have pleaded formally "not guilty." Do you swear that you did the deed, or otherwise?—I did not.

Did you know the woman Dayton?—Yes Sir.

Did you come here to Hongkong with her?—Yes, Sir.

State all you know concerning the woman Dayton.

Prisoner—I left Chafoo on July 8th, and arrived in Manila about July 17th on the s.s. "Alexandra," a U.S.S. Naval collier. On my arrival at Manila I stopped at the Hotel Franco. There I met Miss Dayton and Miss Marshall. Miss Dayton I had slight acquaintance with, but Miss Marshall I did not know. About a week after my arrival in Manila Miss Dayton and Miss Marshall were in their room, and I was there also. A woman named B. Booth came to the Hotel, and to the room occupied by Miss Marshall and Miss Dayton. Miss Booth asked Miss Dayton to sign some paper relative to house 92, Calle Alejandro, and also papers relating to insurance money on a house which was burned down at the rear of 92 Calle Alejandro. Miss Dayton signed the papers relating to 92, Calle Alejandro, but wouldn't sign the insurance papers. There was then some discussion between the three women which ended in Miss Marshall ordering Miss Booth out of the hotel. Miss Marshall then called the manager of the hotel, pointed to Miss Booth, and said to him—"Get that woman out of here before I hurt her." Miss Booth then left without further trouble. That afternoon I met Miss Booth out driving, and she asked me to try to get Miss Dayton to meet her alone. I told her I would try, but I did not think it would be of any use. Miss Booth then became very angry and said, referring to Miss Dayton—"Well she's got my money and I am going to get it. If I don't I will get even with her." I then went to the hotel and informed Miss Dayton and Miss Marshall what Miss Booth had said. Miss Marshall said she was not afraid. Miss Dayton said nothing. On July 26th Miss Dayton and myself went to Smith, Bell and Co., who are the agents for several insurance companies in Manila. There we met Mr. O'Brien, the lawyer. Miss Dayton was handed a cheque for 3,595 pesos, and signed a receipt that she had received payment in full, or words to that effect. We left Smith, Bell and Co. and went to Mr. O'Brien's office. Miss Dayton endorsed the cheque and told Mr. O'Brien to cash it, as it was after banking hours, about five o'clock. She told Mr. O'Brien also to buy the equivalent of 3,000 pesos in United States Postal Orders—that would be equivalent to \$1,500 gold. Mr. O'Brien gave Miss Dayton a receipt for the cheque and we left and returned to the hotel. Next day, July 27th, Mr. O'Brien came to the hotel and to the room occupied by Miss Dayton and Miss Marshall, and handed Miss Dayton fifteen postal money orders for 100 gold dollars each. Mr. O'Brien advised Miss Dayton to leave Manila. On July 29th Miss Marshall was subpoenaed to appear before Prosecuting Attorney George at Manila. She showed Miss Dayton and I the subpoena, remarking that it was about the insurance money. That same day Miss Dayton asked me to accompany her to Hongkong from Manila, and at Miss Dayton's request I purchased two passages to Hongkong on the s.s. "Eastern," which was the first boat to leave Manila. That night, July 29th, Miss Dayton handed Miss Marshall one of the postal money orders telling her to cash it if she could and to endorse it, if necessary. Miss Dayton also gave Miss Marshall an order on a debt collector to pay over to Miss Marshall all money that he collected for her, obits amounting to \$100 which she had placed in his hand. Miss Dayton also gave Miss Marshall letters and obits amounting to \$500 and

also gave her an order on Mr O'Brien the lawyer, for the balance of the insurance money, about 595 pesos. Next morning, July 30, at 6.30 we left, Miss Dayton expressing the wish to go out on board the steamer and get out of town. Upon arrival at the steam launch landing Miss Dayton was met by a Chinaman who said to her "Hello, Miss Gertie you go way." She replied "yes" and said "goodbye." I asked who he was and she replied that he was one of the servants at No 92 Calle Alejandro. We got on board the steamer, Miss Dayton going down to the cabin with me. Miss Dayton took all her jewellery, money orders and other papers of value. She handed them to me wrapped up in a handkerchief. She put all her silver and other articles of value which were in her dressing case in my box. She told me that if the police came I was to take them ashore to Miss Marshall. Miss Dayton had made the remark that she wanted to get away because she was afraid she would be arrested by the police for taking the insurance money. The box with the silverware and other articles of value was not in the cabin but was placed outside on the stairway leading from the saloon, Miss Dayton saying that if the police came they could not get my bag. We remained on deck night and day watching for the police. On July 31st one of the passengers was passing around pieces of candy. I took a piece down to Miss Dayton and she expressed a desire for sweets. I went ashore on the half past 11 launch, bought some sweets and daily papers, and returned with the half past twelve launch, Miss Dayton having remained below all the time. We left Manila on July 31st, having been on board the steamer two days and two nights. We arrived in Hongkong on August 3rd. Upon our arrival we decided to stop at the Hongkong Hotel. On arrival at the landing stage Miss Dayton told me she saw a Chinaman whom she knew by sight. We went to the Hotel and were assigned Room 184. This was before tiffin, about 11 o'clock. We went down and had tiffin, afterwards going out for a ricksha ride, going to the race track and back. We went along the water front. There I saw Ship Street which I had seen before. A short distance from there we saw a carpenter's shop in which were some camphorwood boxes, and Miss Dayton expressed a desire to purchase one in which to put curios. Upon arrival at the Hotel we laid down upon the bed for a rest, and on getting up we played cards and had several drinks of brandy, of which I had two bottles in the room, as well as two bottles of whisky. By dinner time I saw we had had too much drink. Previous to that I had unpacked my trunk. Miss Dayton and I sent our soiled linen to the wash, Miss Dayton making out the list. I unpacked my trunk and put my clothes on the verandah as they were damp, and I wiped out the trunk with one of my old night-shirts. The trunk was wet with mildew and I placed it on the verandah after emptying it. The balance of my clothes I placed in a bureau drawer. We went down to dinner and had a bottle of claret wine with our dinner. After dinner we went to the drawing-room, where Miss Dayton met a man and woman whom she knew and whom she introduced to me as Mr. and Mrs. Feist. Mr. and Mrs. Feist left shortly afterwards. Miss Dayton retired for a few minutes. Returning, she told me Mrs. Feist wanted to go "up the street" on a spree. She said "Let's go to the King Edward Hotel where Mr. and Mrs. Feist are stopping and all go up the street together." This we proceeded to do.

His Honour—All four of you?

Defendant—No, Miss Dayton and I. Upon arriving at the corner of the Hongkong Hotel, going on to King Edward Hotel, we were met by a man coming from the direction of the King Edward Hotel who stopped and said "Good evening, Gertie." Miss Dayton caught hold of my arm and said "Don't go far." I moved off a few paces and heard the man talking to Miss Dayton in an excited tone. In a few minutes she rejoined me and said "That was a man I had done for some money." Upon arriving at the King Edward Hotel and inquiring for Mr. and Mrs. Feist we were told they were out. We took chairs and went to see a woman whom Miss Dayton called Miss

Hempstead. On arriving there we had several drinks, several bottles of wine. We arrived there about 10 o'clock. We had about a dozen bottles of wine as near as I can judge. When going up to Miss Hempstead's I was feeling drunk and in the course of my stay there I naturally got considerably drunker. I remember Miss Dayton asking me on arrival to show Miss Hempstead the postal orders, but she did not ask me to show her the jewellery which I carried, as she was afraid the police here would get her in Hongkong. I scarcely remember leaving Miss Hempstead's, but we went to one or more houses of the same character, but I do not recognise the witness Miss Leavitt. I do not know when or how I arrived at the Hotel. I mean the brothel in Ship Street. Americans have different names for it. I do not remember leaving Miss Dayton at the hotel in Ship Street. The next thing I remember was waking at 7 o'clock next morning in a Japanese hotel or brothel with a Japanese woman at my side. I searched my clothes to see if I had all my valuables. I found I had Miss Dayton's jewellery and my own still intact. I left the place quietly and quickly so as to avoid being seen, wondering all the time how I had got there. I went to the street to get a ricksha but not seeing one I went a little further. In passing I saw the carpenter's shop where Miss Dayton and I had seen the camphorwood box. Thinking Miss Dayton would be angry because I had stopped out at night, and knowing she wanted a camphorwood box I bought one more as a peace offering for stopping out. I then returned to the Hongkong Hotel and told the boy to have the box taken to my room. I went up by the lift to my room. Upon arriving at our room I opened the door gently so as not to awaken Miss Dayton. The door was not locked, because when we went down to dinner the night before I left the door open so that the boy could straighten up the room. Upon entering the room I saw Miss Dayton's body on the bed. I was almost knock-d-speechless. A thousand thoughts seemed to be running through my brain at once. I tried to remember whether I had returned to the Hongkong Hotel before going down to the Ship Street brothel but could not remember anything. I realised the awkward position which I was in; that we were there as man and wife under an assumed name, Miss Dayton a known prostitute wanted in Manila for taking the insurance money, and we had been "up the street" the night before, drinking very heavily. I formed a biased opinion against the Hongkong police authorities and was afraid, and knowing that the boy would come up with a camphorwood trunk shortly, I put the body in my trunk which was empty on the verandah, and quickly grasping two bath towels, covered the body over and closed the lid. The boy came with the camphorwood box shortly afterwards. I thought about notifying the police, but my position would be all against me. I was here all alone in Hongkong, and could not think who could have done it, or if she had done it herself, so I decided to get rid of the body. After I had sat in the room debating for sometime with myself which was the best course to pursue, I took the trunk to Butterfield and Swire's, seeing in the paper that Butterfield and Swire were the agents for the first available steamer. I returned to the hotel and became frightened; I went back to Butterfield and Swire's and asked the gentleman—one of the witnesses—if I could ship the trunk to Sydney. He told me I would have to come back on Monday. I went back to the hotel again, and in passing I noticed the "Monteagle" was in the bay, and as she was about due to sail I got the trunk from Butterfield and Swire and took it out to the "Monteagle." I emphatically deny trying to sink the trunk in the bay. Then I returned ashore; went to the hotel to my room; picked up my grip (bag) without putting anything in it, and left the hotel after being there about five minutes. I went and slept at a place—the Y.M.C.A. Mission, I think. It is a place on the water front near the Naval Canteen (Sailors and Soldiers Home?). I did not care about sleeping in the hotel that night, as I was afraid, because those who did the deed might have wreaked their vengeance on me also. The next day,

August 5th, I pawned two diamonds of which I had five the same size I was taking home. I also had a gold vest chain and a diamond locket which had thirteen diamonds on it in the shape of a crescent. I also had a pair of diamond and ruby sleeve links a diamond scarf pin and some English and American gold, but I did not care to exchange it. I wanted to leave the country and lose myself, so I pawned these diamonds to get some money. At first, after discovering the body and placing it in the trunk, I was going to take everything with me, and placed all the clothes and everything in the room in the camphorwood box; but I changed my mind. I intended to go to North China or Korea, and left Hongkong on August 6th by the *Tosa Maru*, on board of which vessel I slept on the night of August 5th. I arrived at Shanghai and went to Chefoo, with the object of going to Korea or Siberia. From the time I arrived at Chefoo until I arrived here, the Court has evidence which is true. When I left the hotel here, I left all the keys behind me, with the exception of the key of my bag, which I carried.

This concluded the statement of Adsetts, and the Court rose until ten o'clock this morning.

Wednesday, October 23rd.

The trial of William Hall Adsetts for the murder of Gertrude Dayton on August 4th in this Colony was concluded. The spectators in Court were more numerous than on previous days, and by ten o'clock there was no sitting accommodation available, and very little standing room.

As before the Attorney-General, Hon. Mr. W. Rees Davies, instructed by Mr G. E. Morrell, from the Crown Solicitor's office, prosecuted, and Sir Henry Berkeley, K.C., instructed by Mr. R. Harding, appeared for the accused.

The special jurors were:—E. A. Ram (foreman), C. W. May, D. W. Craddock, J. Barton, A. Turner, H. P. White and G. L. Tomlin. Adsetts again entered the witness stand, and was cross-examined by the Attorney-General:—

I understand you admit all the evidence put forward by the prosecution, except in so far as the murder took place and the fact that you did not, as alleged, put the box over the sampan?—Some parts I don't admit.

What are they?—Seeing the boy at six o'clock in the hotel, and some minor details I don't admit.

I put it to you in short that you admit you came here by the *Eastern* as alleged; you admit that you went to the Hongkong Hotel, and were seen there by the various witnesses who gave evidence?—I admit being seen by some of those witnesses.

And that you were as a fact staying at the hotel with the deceased under the names of Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Jones?—I do, sir.

You admit you went to the house with her known as No. 12, and to the house occupied by Miss Leavitt?—I admit going to the house kept by Miss Hempstead, but do not recollect the other place.

His Lordship—I think you stated that you went somewhere else?

Prisoner—I went to some other houses.

The Attorney-General. I will come to that later. Then you admit the details about taking the trunk to Messrs. Butterfield and Swire's, leaving it there, returning and exchanging the name of the place to which you wished to send it?—Yes sir.

You admit all that, and that you yourself subsequently took it in a sampan to the *Monteagle*?—I do, sir.

You admit the purchase of the box?—Yes, sir.

You admit the pawning of the diamonds on the day after, and that you left the Colony as alleged by the *Tosa Maru*?—Yes, sir.

Now you admit all these statements, notwithstanding that your learned counsel has cross-examined the various witnesses at length to show that it was a case of mistaken identity, and that you were not the man who went to these places?—I admit that.

What was your business before you were arrested?—I was returning home to the United States as a civilian.

We had yesterday some testimonials as to your character and antecedents. Would you have any occupation now if you were not under arrest?—Yes, if I was at home in the States. I am a plumber and tinsmith.

What were you doing at Manila?—When sir? At the time you were in the society of the deceased woman?—What was my intention?

I don't want to know what your intentions were. What were you doing there?—I went to Manila en route to the United States.

How long had you been staying there?—From July 17th to July 30th.

During that time were you engaged in any occupation?—No, sir. It wasn't necessary.

How long had you known Gertrude Dayton?—I met Miss Dayton about a year ago this month in house 92, Calle Alejandro, had about three or four minutes' conversation with her and left the house.

At Manila?—Yes.

Had you seen her in the meantime since that meeting?—No, sir.

Had you any letter communication with her during that time?—No letters came to me, but I saw letters from her.

So I may take it you only saw her once before you saw her in Manila this time?—Yes.

Therefore your acquaintance with her was quite casual, was it not?—Yes.

Now, as regards the dispute that took place between B. Booth, Miss Marshall and the deceased woman, you were called in by Miss Booth to act as a sort of intermediary?—No, sir.

I put it to you that Miss Booth called you in and asked you to act as a mediator between her and the deceased?—No, sir. She did not call me into the hotel.

I have not said so.—I said I met Miss Booth while out driving, and she asked me to get Miss Dayton to meet her alone.

That is exactly what I said. Why do you think then that Miss Booth should have selected you to approach Miss Dayton on her behalf?—I suppose because she saw Miss Dayton and I out driving, and Miss Marshall also. We used to go to the theatre together as well.

In fact, she knew at the time you were living with the deceased?—I was not living with her.

You were in the same hotel?—In the same hotel, but not living with her.

Were you friendly with Miss Booth?—No.

Did you have much discussion about the insurance payments?—None whatever.

Do you mean to say that when Miss Booth asked you to try to get Miss Dayton to meet her alone, no reference was made to the subject in dispute?—No. In the hotel when Miss Booth tried to get Miss Dayton to sign certain papers I heard the conversation.

When you met Miss Booth alone, why did you tell her you would try to get Miss Dayton to meet her, but that you did not think she would?—I meant that Miss Dayton was under no obligation to me, and I did not think it was any use.

This gentleman, Mr. O'Brien, according to your statement is a lawyer in Manila?—I believe so.

And he, according to what you say, in his capacity as a lawyer advised Miss Dayton to get out of Manila, having already carried out monetary transactions for her?—Yes, sir.

Now you saw Miss Dayton, as you say, on one occasion previous to this year, before you saw her as a casual acquaintance at this hotel?—Yes.

Do you mean to suggest to me that during the time you were with her at the hotel your relations were purely of a chaste character?—Positively.

Why do you suppose Miss Dayton asked you to accompany her to Hongkong?—I mentioned that I was coming to Hongkong myself.

Would a woman with whom you were not on terms of intimacy select you particularly as company to go away with?—She did it in order that she might avoid the ends of justice in Manila. And I was often in Miss Dayton and in Miss Marshall's company, and I told them I was going home on the *Minnesota*. They persuaded me to stay, and I remained there and played cards with them, and went out riding and driving.

At any rate you were a willing victim; you accepted her proposal and left Manila with

her, and became her familiar friend until the night of her death?—Not necessarily. No, sir.

Well you were with her and registered in the hotel as husband and wife?—Yes, sir, but there was no criminality on my part.

I am not talking about criminality. It is a small matter having regard to the charge under which you at present stand. The deceased woman trusted Miss Marshall implicitly, didn't she?—I don't know.

You told us she gave her those orders? I said Miss Dayton gave Miss Marshall one of the post office orders.

I put it to you that the deceased regarded Miss Marshall as a friend, and trusted her implicitly?—Yes, they were friends.

Now, on leaving Manila you told us that a Chinese coolie spoke to Miss Dayton?—At the steam launch landing.

Do you attach any importance to the fact of the Chinese boy speaking to her? Not necessarily.

What importance do you attach to the conversation at this time between her and the boy?—I am just stating the facts of what happened from the time of my leaving Manila until my arrival at Hongkong.

Do you suggest that the boy made any communication to her with regard to the dispute between her and Miss Booth?—Miss Dayton seemed to be excited at the time.

Other people spoke to her, you know, on board the ship. What I want to know from you is, what is there in the fact of this boy saying good bye to Miss Gertie?—I don't attach any importance whatever to the fact, only that the boy spoke to her and Miss Dayton became excited. Nobody spoke to her on board the ship.

All her jewellery you say, was entrusted to you?—Yes.

And she remained on the deck of the steamer at night watching for the police?—I remained on deck at night.

In custody of her belongings?—In custody of her belongings.

What was to be your ultimate destination when you both left Manila?—Hongkong.

You booked for Hongkong?—Yes.

And paid for the tickets?—Yes.

For both?—I did.

That was a generous act on your part, wasn't it?—No, the money was to be refunded on arrival at Hongkong.

The amount of her ticket, or the amount of yours and hers?—The amount of her ticket. Not yours?—No, sir.

You were not yourself travelling at her expense?—No, sir.

On arrival at Hongkong there was another Chinaman it appears?—Yes, Miss Dayton said she thought she knew him.

Did it strike you as being a most remarkable fact that a person landing in Hongkong should know a Chinese boy?—Not necessarily.

What importance do you attach to the fact?—None, she was in a house where there were a number of Chinese servants.

I suppose on the voyage from Manila to Hongkong you and Miss Dayton were in perpetual conversation on a variety of subjects?—I can't follow you.

You can follow, me perfectly well. —But I cannot hear, sir.

I put it to you that you had conversations on a variety of subjects during the voyage?—Yes.

Why do you think it necessary to tell the Court about that particular instance of the Chinese boy?—Because we met him there and she was excited. She was seeing things and looking at every Chinaman on the boat coming across from Manila.

What was there on her mind, do you think?—I do not know, sir. I am not a mind reader, and cannot read a woman's mind.

The whole thing is part of your story, is it not, that some unknown man committed the murder. First the story of the Chinese boy alarming her at Manila; then the Chinese boy alarming her here, and then the strange gentleman who accosted her?—Yes.

And what you regard as an important part?—In a way, yes.

And why didn't you tell me that before. Is there anything about the statement of the Chinese boy that you regarded as important?—I thought it was peculiar in Manila, and coming over Miss Dayton was acting peculiar and strange.

Having regard to the fact that this woman was murdered, you consider that her seeing this Chinese boy gives some clue to it?—In no way.

There was something on the warpath?—There was something strange about those boys meeting her.

You went to the Hongkong Hotel, and you say you had two bottles of brandy and two bottles of whisky?—Yes, sir.

The two bottles of whisky were found in the room; what became of the brandy?—That I don't know.

Where did you get the brandy?—At Chefoo, you did not dispose of them yourself?—No.

And they were not found afterwards?—Not to my knowledge.

Who are Mr. and Mrs. Feist?—I don't know. They dined at the next table to you that night?—I believe they did, or one near.

Had you ever seen them before?—No, sir.

Have you seen them since, or either of them?—No.

So far as they are concerned, apart from the conversation had when they were introduced to you, you did not see them again?—No, but I can describe them.

Upon arriving at the corner of the Hongkong Hotel, you were met by a man coming from the direction of the King Edward Hotel. What was that man like?—He appeared to me like a Jew. I did not get a good look at him, as his back was towards me.

As soon as he spoke to her she immediately turned round and said to you—"Don't go far"?—Yes.

Did you hear the conversation between them?—No.

You heard her talking excitedly, didn't you?—I heard him.

Did you walk away deliberately not to hear what passed between your lover and the other man?—Who? She was not my lover.

Well, you were living with her. I will call her your companion, or what you please. Do you mean to say you walked away not to hear the conversation?—Yes. It was none of my business.

It was not about the dispute between her and Miss Booth?—I don't know.

How long did this conversation last?—Four or five minutes.

You were standing a few paces off the whole time?—About ten or twelve paces.

And you say there was no further conversation between you and her as to who this man was?—No.

Supposing he was in Court to-day, could you point him out?—No, sir.

Was he an old man?—As near as I could see he was a man between 25 and 30.

Did he see you with her?—I suppose he did. We were both going towards him.

Now I suppose your suggestion is that this murder was committed by some man to avenge the wrong done to Miss Booth by the deceased?—I don't know.

You have no suggestion whatever as to the reason why she was murdered?—No.

Then you don't yourself think that the motive was in any way actuated by the dispute between her and Miss Booth with regard to money matters?—I don't know anything about it.

One now, who do you think committed the murder?—I do not know, sir.

Who do you think did it?—I do not know.

What are your suspicions in the matter?—The first thing I thought of was B. Booth.

And that the man who murdered her did it at the instigation of Miss Booth?—I don't know who it was. I thought of Miss Booth because the deceased had stolen money from her.

You don't suggest it was the strange man?—I don't suggest anything.

Apart from that fact, all you are prepared to say to the jury is that you think the murder was committed through Miss Booth?—I am not prepared to say anything.

You needn't have any compunction in stating what you really do think about anyone else?—The only thing I said was that my thoughts first went to Miss Booth on account of Miss Dayton stealing the money from her.

How long were you at No. 12 that night?—I don't know. About an hour and a half, two hours, or three hours. I couldn't say exactly.

Were you still in possession of all her jewellery?—Yes.

Having regard to the fact that you had taken a room in the Hongkong Hotel, did you think it necessary to carry all that jewellery about?—I did it at Miss Dayton's request.

On that night, at the various houses to which you went, do you mean to suggest that you had the whole of that jewellery deposited on your person?—Yes.

Was deceased wearing any jewellery?—One or two rings and some pins to pin her dress up. Two of those pins were mine.

She was going to these gay houses to meet her old friends, all of whom were well known to her, and she preferred you to carry her jewellery in your pockets rather than to wear it herself?—She couldn't wear it all.

How many other houses did you go to?—One or more, I don't remember.

How many do you think?—I am not prepared to say.

Where did you leave the deceased?—I don't know.

Do you suggest you were so helplessly drunk that you don't know anything that took place?—Yes, sir.

And then you found yourself in a Japanese house in Ship Street?—Yes.

Were you carried there by force, do you think?—I don't know how I arrived there.

Rather curious wasn't it, that when you had a woman living with you at the hotel here, you subsequently visited some of the English houses, and then found yourself in a low brothel in Ship Street?—Not necessarily. I was not intimate with the woman.

If that is the case you were conscious of the fact that you were going to a Japanese house?—No, sir.

You just suggested that you went intentionally because the woman with you was unwell?—I don't remember going, but would rather go to any other place than be with her.

What was the number of the Japanese brothel?—I don't know.

Have you got any witnesses to speak to the fact of your being there?—No.

You said, I suppose, the woman with whom you stayed?—I suppose I did.

How did you pay, in English gold or American money?—I don't know.

You were sober at that time?—I did not pay the woman in the morning; that I know.

Then you didn't pay her at all?—I guess I didn't. I don't remember paying her.

I should think you would be a welcome visitor at Ship Street again. You say you awoke next morning as soon as it was light, about seven o'clock?—It would be about seven as near as I could judge.

It would be light about five in the month of August?—Yes.

You were seen at the Hongkong Hotel at six o'clock that morning by the boy. —No, sir.

You deny that, do you?—Emphatically.

You never went to the hotel from the time you left it the night before when you went out to dinner until I arrived in the morning about eight o'clock.

What time do you say you bought the camphorwood box?—Immediately after I left the Japanese house.

I put it to you that you were in the Hongkong Hotel at six o'clock that morning before you bought this box?—No, sir.

Why did you want to avoid being seen leaving Ship Street?—I did not care about being seen coming out of a place of that kind when I was stopping at one of the principal hotels.

Do you mean seriously to suggest to us that you thought this box was a suitable peace offering, and would be appreciated by a lady?—Yes. She said before she was going to get one to put curios in.

And that was the only reason for you buying the box?—Yes.

It was a rather curious sort of present to give a lady, wasn't it?—Not when she had a desire for one.

And this great big ugly box was to account for your misdeed in leaving her?—It was no misdeed. I was my own boss and under no obligation.

And you expect the Court to believe that story?—I do.

What cause had you to fear her anger?—I had no cause.

I put it to you, now, that you murdered that woman, and got that box with the pure intention at first, of putting her body in it.—No, sir.

And finding for some reason best known to yourself that it did not suit your requirements you subsequently put her body in the other box?—No, sir. I bought the box and then returned to the hotel.

That box being of wood would float rather easier than the other box?—I suppose it would.

It would not be so easy to sink it from a sampan?—That I do not know. I never tried to sink one.

This box where you bought the box is further east than Ship Street, isn't it?—I don't know. It was to my right facing the water front.

Now I will take you to the finding of the corpse. You must have been greatly shocked when you found it on the bed?—Yes.

Was she dead?—She appeared to me to be dead.

Are you sure she was dead?—Positive.

If she had not been it would have been easier for you to call the hotel people and send for a doctor, wouldn't it?—I saw she was dead.

What was the position of the body?—It was lying in the middle of the bed, on its back.

Was the bed made?—Yes.

Did it appear to you to have been slept on?—No, it was in the same condition as it was in on the afternoon before when Miss Dayton and I laid down on it for a rest.

Assuming that the blood on the mattress came from the deceased, and was on the lower portion, the bed must have been made by somebody before you arrived?—That is on the assumption that the blood came from the deceased. There was no blood or mark on the sheets.

Had she a band round her neck when you saw her?—Yes.

What sort of a band?—The band on exhibition.

Did that band belong to her?—I think it did.

Had she one like it?—Something similar.

Was she wearing it the night before?—I can't say. I don't notice women's apparel so much as that.

The hairbrush, was that there?—Yes.

When you saw the body were there any rings on the fingers?—I did not notice.

There were no rings found on the fingers when the body was discovered in the box?—I don't know.

She had rings on the night before?—Yes, sir. One or two.

What did you do, take them off?—No.

What do you suggest became of the rings?—I have no suggestion to make.

When you put the body into the trunk the hands must have come in contact with yours. Didn't you notice whether she had rings on them?—I did not notice.

Now, Sir, when you found the corpse as you allege, why didn't you at once call up the hotel people?—I thought of the embarrassing and awkward position I was in, and could not remember whether I returned before going to the Japanese brothel.

If you had been at the Japanese brothel as you suggest, it would be very easy for you to demonstrate your innocence?—No, sir.

You do not know the number of the house in Ship Street where you slept?—No, they all look alike.

It ought to be very easy for you to find out the number when your life is concerned?—I do not see why that should be. I thought at the time of the box, and the circumstances all pointed against me.

How did you return to the hotel?—By ricksha.

It ought to be easy for you to get hold of the coolie?—I did not see, and could not identify him.

You were rather doubtful whether you returned to the hotel that night?—I was not doubtful, but I could not remember anything, and tried to collect my thoughts.

You've just sworn positively that you did not return to the hotel?—Yes.

And when you saw the body you tried to think whether you returned to the hotel before going to Ship Street?—Yes, I tried to make myself think whether I returned to the hotel, and came to the conclusion that I could not have returned and left again in the condition I was when I went to Ship Street.

And one of the thousand thoughts that passed through your mind was whether you returned to the hotel before you went to Ship Street?—I tried to think, but in the condition I was it was impossible.

Why should it be of any consequence to you whether you returned to the hotel?—I was the last one seen in her company.

Did you consider the fact of your staying at Hongkong with the deceased as man and wife sufficient to justify you in what you did?—Partly.

Miss Dayton was a known prostitute, and wanted in Manila for taking insurance money, was that an element sufficient?—It would bring everything up against me, and I did not want it known at home.

You thought that justified you in getting rid of the body the way you did?—Partly.

Being up the street with her and drinking heavily, that surely was not so terrible as to disgrace you in the eyes of the world?—It was nothing in my favour to drink with a known prostitute.

You started away with her openly from Manila, and took her to a room at the Hongkong Hotel?—On the understanding that I was leaving her here to never see her more.

You formed a biased opinion against the Hongkong police. A good many other people have done that, haven't they?—I had occasion to, sir.

That is the only explanation you have got to give?—Yes.

Do you think deceased killed herself?—I do not know.

You've no opinion at all as to who did it?—No.

Do you mean to suggest that if you were an innocent man you would not be perfectly safe in reporting the matter to the hotel and the police authorities?—Everything looked black against me.

It did not look half so black for you as it did afterwards. —Yes, sir. Almost.

I put it to you that if your story is true you must have been mad—must have been a lunatic?—Not necessarily. I was the only one in the room when the box arrived, and that would have been evidence enough in itself to have me arrested.

At any rate you were unable, notwithstanding the fact that the defence was carefully considered for you, to bring a single witness to Court to speak of your movements that night?

—On my arrival in Hongkong I spoke to my solicitor, Mr. Harding, and told him where I had been, but he said it was no good, as I could not be identified in a place like that. He asked me when I was there, and I told him Saturday night.

You told me before that the murder was in connection with the Booth matter?—Everything flashed through my mind, and Miss Booth came up first because Miss Dayton had stolen five or six thousand, and Miss Booth made the remark in Manila that she would get even with her. I am not here to accuse anybody.

How long were you in the room after you got there, before you proceeded to pack the body in the trunk?—Three, four or five minutes.

Did you sit down and think it over before you did this?—No I stood by the bed.

And within five minutes you jammed the body in the trunk the way it was discovered?—I placed the body in the trunk; I did not jam it in.

I suppose you knew at that time that your conduct, if found out, was fatal to your life?—No.

Or that you were doing at any rate, an act which would render you liable to the gravest suspicion?—I did not stop to think of those things. Self-preservation was what I thought of.

And you did not tell the police or anybody, in order to save your good name; is that what you suggest?—Yes.

And afterwards you were afraid to stay in the hotel. Why should the persons who did the deed wish to wreak their vengeance on you?—I don't know.

What do you mean by that?—I was in the company of the murdered woman.

Then because some other person or persons murdered the woman, you thought they might come and murder you?—Yes.

The deed was done in your absence. How would the person who did it know anything

about you?—How would anyone know Miss Dayton was staying at the hotel?

Instead of spending that night at the hotel you slept at the Young Men's Christian Association?—That is what I call it. It is a sailors' home.

Have you any evidence as to this?—I have not, but I believe if the man and woman who are in the place could come here and hear me describe the general run of the place they would testify that I slept there that night.

Would you have any trouble in convincing the Court that you slept at a Japanese brothel?—I do not know which brothel I was in.

Why did you want to leave the country and lose yourself?—Because my name was mixed up in the affair. I decided the best thing for me to do was to go away, and stay away for ever.

You won't say, sir, because you had been guilty of a foul murder, and to escape justice?—No, sir (emphatically.)

Your conduct when arrested at Chefoo was not that of an innocent man?—I did not want my name mixed up in it.

Why did you not state when arrested that you spent your time in a brothel?—I was asked for no statement.

I put it to you that the whole of your story from beginning to end is a subterfuge, a pure concoction?—No, sir. It is nothing but the truth; the Gospel truth. When I returned to Hongkong the witnesses failed to identify me; why should I not now have trouble in getting witnesses in my favour?

The jury for the last two days have been investigating the question as to whether you came here at all. Now you admit the whole story, all but the murder, and I am putting it to you, your story from beginning to end is a concoction. You displayed some ingenuity in the matter?—No, Sir. I have given my statement, and am being cross-examined, and if there are any lies they certainly would come out.

Your wife was living at Chefoo when you went there?—No, sir.

Has she not been living at the Beach Hotel at Chefoo?—No, sir.

Where has she been living?—My wife is in Philadelphia.

At the time?—She has been there for years.

My instructions are that your wife was living at the Beach Hotel, Chefoo.—I was living with a woman and was in partnership with her.

Was the woman there when you arrived?—No, sir. She left the night previous to my arrival.

She heard you were coming?—I don't know.

From Chefoo you went to Shanghai?—From Shanghai I went to Chefoo.

Did you pawn a lady's ring at Shanghai?—No, sir.

You were in Shanghai on the morning of the 10th August?—I cannot remember the date.

You pledged a diamond ring for \$180 with a firm of jewellers in Nanking Road?—No, sir.

You swear that?—Yes, sir.

Positively swear that?—Positively.

Did you go to Ullmann and Company?—No.

You know where Ullmann and Company is?—I don't know. I am not acquainted with Shanghai.

Did you pawn there any property?—No sir.

This is a representation made to the Consul General of the United States, your own consul, from the Captain Superintendent of Police, in which it states that Adsett, who is now detained on a charge of murder, arrived in Chefoo on the 10th August and pledged a ring with a firm of jewellers here. You deny the whole of that?—Yes, sir.

At those houses which you visited that night with the deceased woman did you see any other men?—I saw some men in one of the other houses.

Did you see her have any conversation with any other man?—No, sir.

So far as your recollection goes, until you became intoxicated and lost your senses, she was not in the company of any other man that night?—No, sir.

Did you see her have any conversation with any man except yourself?—Not to my knowledge.

At Miss Hempstead's house you and deceased were drunk together. Anybody else at the house? Was it the same at Miss Leavitt's house?—I don't remember being at Miss Leavitt's house.

You never saw the deceased woman have any conversation with any other man that night?—Not to my knowledge.

You did not see her?—No.

This concluded the cross-examination and prisoner returned to the dock.

Sir Henry Berkeley, who spoke for 55 minutes, then commenced his address.

He said:—Gentlemen of the jury, the charge against the prisoner is the wilful murder of Gertrude Dayton, and the oath you have taken is that you will find a verdict of guilty or not guilty according to the evidence. Gentlemen, I feel impelled to thus address you, as it may seem unnecessarily, because it may be assumed that men of your age and experience are aware that juries can only find a verdict according to the evidence; but gentlemen, believe me that the warning I have respectfully ventured to bring before you is not impertinent, is not unnecessary in the particular case under consideration, for gentlemen, I venture to say that there is hardly a man in this colony, hardly except one even in this court, who has not discussed this question at a time when it was never assumed that the man Adsett would come before a Hongkong jury to take his trial. I will venture to go further and to say that there are very few, if any, of those who discussed the case who had not already found the man guilty before he arrived in Hongkong.

Now gentlemen, that circumstance, together with the unwise act of the prisoner in fleeing from the Colony in the manner that he did, that circumstance renders my task herculean unless you will find a verdict only according to the evidence; unless you will remember that no one saw prisoner commit the act the Crown charges against him. That he can only be found guilty upon what is known as circumstantial evidence must be the logical result of accurate reasoning from the evidence before you. But it must be a cool, calm and independent judgment, a judgment free from all fear of what the public may say if you find a verdict of which the public will disapprove, the unthinking public, the public that did not hear the evidence, and the public that having heard the evidence are incapable of giving the proper legal weight to the evidence. Gentlemen, the case for the Crown is that the prisoner arrived here with this woman and went to the Hongkong Hotel, and for the purpose of getting possession of her money and her jewellery did her to death and disposed of her body. That is the case for the Crown in a few words. If I took to the end of the day and the Attorney-General follows me for hours he could say nothing more than I have told you in these words. The case for the prisoner is that he came into the Hongkong Hotel, found the woman lying on the bed and disposed of her body to save himself from the charge that he could not but feel must be laid against him, against which he did not feel courageous enough at the moment to stand. And he fled. Now, gentlemen, I say there is a great mystery which you have to solve, and the solution of that mystery is not to be in any way assisted but rather obscured and prevented by inflammatory speeches to you and to which I trust you will not be subjected. The only solution is by the process to which I will ask your attention for a few minutes, that is to say a careful review, calm and logical, of the facts that have been proved. Ex post facto acts are most dangerous in arriving at a conclusion. One of the things that no doubt makes the public condemn the prisoner; one of the things which is apparently considered most damning is the fact of his flight. Gentlemen, that is merely an incident to which no weight should be attached. The prisoner may be perfectly innocent and yet afraid to stand the charge, and so he fled. It is of course equally to be considered in fairness to the prisoner that after he fled he subsequently volunteered to take his trial in Hongkong if he were duly defended. I say, and it cannot be contradicted, that there was no law by which a prisoner could have been forcibly taken from Chefoo to Manila, and it is only in common fairness to the prisoner that when you consider that he fled that you also give him such credit as he may be entitled to from the fact that ultimately he was willing to take his trial. Gentlemen, in every prosecution for murder it is the duty of the prosecution to prove two

things. One is the identity of the person accused of the crime and the second is the identity of the corpse as the person whom the prisoner is alleged to have murdered. It is the duty of the counsel defending to see that the strictest proof is given of these facts. It is monstrous, as I understand from one question in cross-examination by the learned Attorney-General, to suggest that the prisoner could be prejudiced in any defence which his counsel might put forward, merely because his defence, either in whole or in part, had been sketched on the lines of the cross-examination. I did not wish to cross-examine in order to establish the identity, and as far as I can see, had the prisoner pleased to make no statement, the identity of the corpse, with that of the body of Gertrude Dayton, had not been sufficiently proved to the jury. I put it to you that there has not been sufficient identification of the corpse. The Attorney-General has strangely overlooked another part of my cross-examination. At the only time when I had an opportunity of asking a question shadowing that defence, namely, the question I put to the doctor with respect to the presumption of suicide. The question I put to him was as to when a person was found strangled, would the facts as a rule point to the presumption of suicide, or would the facts lay to the presumption of homicide. Now, gentlemen, I put it to you that upon the evidence before you you will not be justified in finding that the prisoner murdered the woman Dayton. Whatever your private feeling may be, you will not be justified in coming to any other conclusion than that the woman Dayton committed suicide. Gentlemen, in all criminal cases while it is not at any time essential to the prosecution to prove motive, it is always well that they should be able to do so, and in all criminal cases where the defence can show a lack of motive it is always extremely valuable for the defence to do so. I submit to you gentlemen, there is no evidence before us which will warrant us in saying that the prisoner, Adsett, had any motive for the murder of the woman Dayton. The motive suggested by the Crown is the robbery of her money, and here there is no evidence of that except the death of the woman, so that the Crown is arguing in a circle. I say there is no motive, and I am going to give you the evidence of the Crown to assist me in showing a lack of motive. The Crown says he murdered her, took possession of her money and her jewels; but the evidence for the Crown was that the woman had entrusted these to him for safe keeping. There is the evidence of Mrs. Hempstead, who said that the woman Dayton, when at her house, asked the prisoner to give her money, and he took out a bundle of forty or fifty notes. You cannot get away from the fact that this is evidence of the fact that the prisoner had possession of the money with the consent of the woman. If you refuse to accept that, there is no use in giving any evidence at all. There is no evidence given by the Crown that the man murdered her for her money. Gentlemen, I say he had that money with her consent, and that fact corroborates the statement of the prisoner when he says that the money and the jewellery had been entrusted to him by Dayton for safe keeping. When a witness is found speaking the truth in Court he has a right to ask you to accept the other part as being true, and it is not inconsistent with reason that a woman who would entrust him with \$1,500 gold, would entrust him with the jewellery, the value of which is not proved. The two things are absolutely consistent, and so far prisoner's story is corroborated by the prosecution. The prisoner, however, gives evidence why the woman gave him the money, and that is a reason which you must take into consideration in coming to your conclusion. The reason was that this woman Dayton was fleeing from Manila with a large sum of money, and she gave it to him because she was afraid of arrest. That is supported by the Crown witness, Josie Marshall, and we may take it that the prisoner is again speaking the truth. Gentlemen, the motive for this murder has not been shown and the only motive which has been suggested has no foundation in reason. The woman Dayton has been proved to have been a fugitive from Manila with a large sum

of money in her possession. I don't ask you to accept that suggestion from me. Pardon my speaking peremptorily, but I think that you will find a verdict of not guilty unless you think the case is proved. In an English court of justice with the system of criminal procedure which is in force here, there are only two verdicts on a charge of murder, guilty or not guilty. In Scotland there is the verdict of not proven, but in English courts where a verdict of not proven would be passed, the verdict is not guilty. Therefore I put it to you that you have no option but to find the charge not proved, and bring in a verdict of not guilty. Gentlemen, I tell you, upon correction from my Lord, that in a case of circumstantial evidence, in order to be sufficient to justify the verdict of guilty, the evidence must be such as to exclude every reasonable hypothesis of innocence. In other words, if it is possible upon the same set of circumstantial facts, that the prisoner may have murdered the woman, or the woman may have committed suicide, you must find the case not proved. Gentlemen, you can only find the prisoner guilty unless you say it is not in reason that the woman could have committed suicide. Let us examine the facts the Crown places before you. Before doing so I will just remind you of the evidence to which I adverted before my last parenthetical remark, and that is that the woman Dayton was fleeing from justice; a fugitive from Manila. She was in a state of mental excitement on the night of her death. The Crown have proved that she was tipsy. We have it on the prisoner's evidence that she was mentally excited and naturally so. All the way from Manila she was on pins and needles lest she should be recognised. There was the man who had seen her, and she would fear that he might telegraph to Manila. Then there was the drink. This man and woman were drinking whisky in their room. There is no reason to doubt that. Then we have the evidence of Miss Leavitt, who says that Miss Dayton was drunk there. All this is calculated to prove that the woman was in a state of tension in which she might have committed suicide. Having got thus far you would not be violating any principles of logic if you were to find that she was in a state of mind in which she might very well have taken her life. Let us now see what evidence there is to support the theory of suicide. Gentlemen, the corpse is found with a waistband round its neck, the waistband that she was wearing the same night, which she must have taken off when undressing. You will remember that I put the question to Doctor Macfarlane, and he acquiesced in my statement that it was the opinion of medical jurists in any question such as this that a jury have to decide between homicidal strangulation and suicidal strangulation. When the body is found to have been strangled with any article of apparel belonging to it in life, and there are no fingermarks to indicate throttling, the medical legal presumption is in favour of suicide. The body is found in a box with the waistband round its neck but no marks on the body showing violence. That might be accounted for by the highly decomposed state of the body at the time. That was the opinion of Doctor Macfarlane, but you have to find from the facts and not on the opinion of Doctor Macfarlane. According to the case for the Crown the woman must have bled very copiously. Gentlemen, you saw the mattress held up on one side of which was a lot of blood. That would come from the ears and nostrils and mouth. I put it to you that if a woman were being strangled by a man, a woman of Miss Dayton's physique, 5ft. 8 ins. in height, that there would have been a terrible struggle, and not only would there have been blood on the mattress but on the chemise. Gentlemen, surely it is an extravagant proposal to put to you that strangulation could have taken place by violence and there be no blood upon the chemise. Now we come to the Doctor's evidence. I asked him if there were any marks of violence on the body? No. Any blood on the chemise? No. Is it a case for the presumption which arises from strangulation where there are no marks of violence and no marks of blood, that it is suicide? Yes. Then I took him on the question of the absence of marks and he said that might be accounted for by the decomposition of the body,

Gentlemen, what about the chemise? There is no decomposition of the chemise. It was seen within three days of the body being put in the trunk, and it had not a jot of blood upon it. Is it suggested that Adsett was calm and cool and that he dressed the body in a clean chemise after he cleaned it? Is there any evidence to warrant such an extravagant conclusion as that? In your duty to the prisoner you will find that the chemise in which the body was found was the chemise she had on at the time of her strangulation. We now come to the case where a woman in the state of mind in which she was might very well have committed suicide. Coming now to the bloodstains on the bed, there was no blood on the sheets and no blood on the pillow. What does this involve? It involved that whoever killed the woman was calm and deliberate enough to remove the sheets. But is that reasonable? The prosecution overlooked that. If the woman was strangled by violence on the bed the blood that issued from her would pass through the sheets first, and the evidence is that when they were seen by O'Sullivan they were exactly as when occupied by the prisoner and the woman. I put it to you that you would not be warranted in saying that the bloodstains on that bed came from the deceased. The explanation is obvious in view of the fact that the bed had been previously occupied. All that the Doctor could say was that the blood was human blood. He could not say how fresh it was. But why should the man go to the trouble of removing the sheets. I put it to you, following the principle I have enunciated, that a man is not to be convicted on circumstantial evidence unless the evidence excludes any hypothesis of innocence. So far as I have gone it is impossible for you to say he must be guilty. According to the theory of the Crown the prisoner left the body in the box, and he left the room at six o'clock to buy a box to replace the trunk in which he had put the body. Is that act, a rash act like that, to run the risk of discovery of the body during his absence, consistent with the coolness and calmness and deliberation of the man who removed the sheets from the bed before he commits the murder and who dresses the body in fresh garments after he has committed the murder? Gentlemen, the prosecution must not blow hot and cold. It must not say in one breath that he was a cool and calculating murderer, and in the next that he is a stupid fellow who does unnecessary things. The police in evidence admitted under my cross-examination that the prisoner could have got a camphorwood box within a stone's throw of the hotel, and there was nothing to take the prisoner so far away. It might be said that he desired to cover up his tracks, but he would be just as much unnoticed in a side street in the centre of the city. Gentlemen, if you come to the conclusion that it is reasonable to believe that the box as alleged by the prosecution was bought merely for the purpose of putting in clothes, why should he have gone all the way to Wanchai? There is the explanation of the prisoner himself: that he bought the box at Wanchai because he happened to be down there and see it. It is the common experience of men of the world that a young man after a debauch would wake up in a house of ill-fame and not remember how he got there. Now about the box. Did he buy it on his way from the brothel for the purpose of making a peace offering, or did he buy it for the purpose of putting the clothes in after he killed the woman? Gentlemen, I have endeavoured to the best of my ability to put this case before you argumentatively, and I ask you not to be carried away by the fluent language of the Attorney-General, who himself may be carried away, though I hope he will not, by the feeling which is prevalent in this country that it will be a most unsatisfactory termination to this trial if the prisoner at the bar be acquitted. Gentlemen, no termination of a trial can be unsatisfactory in the true sense of the word, which is founded upon the evidence given before the jury. Gentlemen, the woman Dayton is dead, and the question for you is did the prisoner kill her; or did she strangle herself? The prisoner is not here before you in answer to the charge of stealing her money. He is not here to answer the charge

of criminally disposing of the dead body. He is not here to answer for any of the acts subsequent to the death of that woman. These acts can only be considered by you as showing a guilty knowledge in his mind, but these are very slight evidence of guilt. Circumstantial evidence is at all times very dangerous. It is still more so when the principal, the only black act against the man is that he did not stand up to meet the charge. Gentlemen, if you convict the prisoner to-day you will, I respectfully submit do so because the evidence points to his having strangled the woman and not because he ran away and tried to dispose of her body. It was foolish and unwise to run away as he did, but I put it to you that you must not convict this man because he did not stand up to take his trial. Gentlemen, I have done. I only give you one last word of warning as to the danger of conviction in criminal cases on circumstantial evidence only. It is only quite recently the public in England have been shocked by the case of a young Jewish barrister, Edalji, who was convicted on circumstantial evidence of maiming horses and cattle. After strenuous efforts on the part of his friends he was released. That is only one of several cases. My learned friend, the Attorney-General, will bear me out when I say that the law books teem with instances of persons convicted upon circumstantial evidence and afterwards found to be innocent. Gentlemen, I do not say that in no case must a man not be convicted on circumstantial evidence. In some cases it was right that a man should be convicted on circumstantial evidence, but I put it to you that the prisoner cannot be convicted because the evidence does not exclude a reasonable hypothesis of his innocence. Everything he did was consistent with his finding the body as he states. Gentlemen, of the Jury, I ask you for your verdict.

The Attorney-General—I propose to confine my observations in the remarks which it is now my duty to address to you in very small compass. The facts are fully before you and I think I shall have your sanction for saying this is certainly one of the most extraordinary cases ever submitted for the consideration of a jury. I say that advisedly because my learned friend seemed to imagine from his remarks that I wished to criticise the conduct of the case put before you by the defence. Gentlemen, I had no intention of doing anything of the kind. It would be presumptuous to criticise the conduct of any case which is entrusted to my friend, Sir Henry Berkeley. But I am entitled to point out that the case is, in my opinion, of an extraordinary character, because you have been invited to consider alternative defences throughout. As I said in cross-examination of the prisoner we were engaged yesterday in investigating as to whether this man was or was not the man who came to Hongkong and visited this particular house. The man himself practically admits all the circumstances short of murder and short of the sampan incident. As regards the theory of suicide which my learned friend has put up, I submit to you that all the circumstances are against any such theory. In the first place what was the motive of the woman for committing suicide? According to the evidence she had some monetary disputes with a woman in Manila but there were no sufficient grounds for supposing that she deliberately strangled herself. She was according to prisoner's own statement in a perfect merry condition after dinner, and asked him to go round to see a lady and gentleman, Mr. and Mrs. Feist, with a view to going up the street. She was at this house in a drunken condition and so far as any motive is concerned the evidence rebuts it. Regarding the evidence that she was drunk, it is extremely improbable that she committed suicide in that way, that she would deliberately put her waistband round her neck and insert her brush so as to cause strangulation. Now as to the mattress. It was turned over and the bloodstains hidden. My learned friend relied on the question of the chemise, and said there would have been blood subsequently found on the woman's body. As a matter of fact we have no evidence upon that point. We have evidence from the ship's officer that blood was flowing from the box, or some other fluid, and it was unlikely that the chemise would not be stained. My learn-

ed friend also points out that there would have been blood stains on the sheet and bed. In all probability prisoner stripped these articles from the bed and took the clothes away before he committed the act. The bed was found in an ordinary condition and the theory that the prosecution puts before you is that before he committed the act considerable force was used. In strangulation blood would come from the nose and mouth, and if the act had been committed by the woman she could not have exercised a great force and in all probability there would not have been the amount of blood of which the analyst speaks. If my learned friend relies on the theory of suicide his client does not. He mentions the thousand thoughts which he tells us about. One of his thoughts was B. Booth—in other words implying that some one had intentionally murdered that woman owing to the dispute which had previously taken place with B. Booth. He also tells us that he would not sleep in the room that night, not because his paramour had committed suicide but because "I was afraid whoever did that deed might wreak their vengeance on me". You are asked to consider what the prisoner's motive is? I repeat that the motive in the case for the Crown is one of plunder. Do you believe the story of the prisoner that this unfortunate woman handed all her jewellery to him? Do you believe the story for a single moment that he was at this house and carried the woman's jewellery about in his pocket? I submit the story is so absolutely unreasonable as to divest it of the slightest credit. In circumstantial evidence there must be an unbroken chain. Is there any broken link in this chain? We have put before you abundant evidence as to the movements of the accused. We have traced him from Manila to the Hongkong Hotel. We have traced the movements of the woman and him throughout that day. All I can say, gentlemen, if the story of the prisoner is to be believed, if he is not a murderer he is a lunatic, for no man with any sanity could possibly have been guilty of such ludicrous conduct as he has. He asks you to believe that when he arrived that night he thought he would be disgraced. He posed as a Simon Pure, that his reputation would be gone, because, forsooth, the woman in the hotel with whom he was in company was not his wife. If the woman had strangled herself there would not have been any marks on the table cloth adjoining. Gentlemen, I could address you for another hour, but I do not think any good would be served by it. My learned friend has appealed to you to give his client every possible fair play. That I am sure you will do. That is the pleasing duty of every British jury. My learned friend has hinted to you in the course of his speech more than once that if your verdict was in favour of his client it would be an unpopular verdict. Gentlemen, by innuendo, it would be suggested that you are wreaking vengeance on the prisoner. It is not within your province to avenge. Vengeance is the prerogative only of a higher power—of the Divine power. There is a higher quality than vengeance and that is justice. That quality you are here to bestow. That justice, and justice only on behalf of the Crown I seek at your hands. I invite you to say that the evidence before you, based as it is upon an unbroken chain, leaves no reasonable doubt in your minds that this man did to death this poor unfortunate woman, and I submit that the charge of wilful murder has been fully sustained.

His Lordship, in summing up, said his duty had been considerably lightened by the statement made by the prisoner, because there was no question of identification and the story of the Crown and that of the prisoner was on all fours, excepting one or two minor points. One of these points was that raised by the prosecution with regard to the alleged attempt to sink the trunk, but as the prisoner had admitted taking the trunk to the "Monteagle" for the purpose of getting rid of it, the jury need take no notice of the point. His Lordship reviewed prisoner's statement and showed there was a hiatus in the stories for the Crown and for the defence which the jury had to fill. They had to confine their attention to sometime in the small hours of Sunday morning after the prisoner and deceased had left the houses up the street and 6 or 7 o'clock. As to the Ship Street

incident, prisoner could produce no evidence of any description as to it; the incident was only supported by his own evidence and then there was the evidence of the boy who saw him at 6 o'clock in the hotel. If the boy spoke the truth the Ship Street story was a myth. He could not be in the Hotel at 6 o'clock if he was sleeping at Ship Street at seven; the carpenter also said the prisoner was there at 6.30. The jury had to consider these facts in coming to a verdict. The theory of the prosecution was that prisoner strangled the woman and went out and got the box to put the body in. That may be true or not. On the other hand the prisoner states that either the woman was murdered by an outsider or suicided. As to the outside person the jury could not give the story credence as it was impossible for anyone to enter the Hongkong Hotel without being seen or heard, and there was no motive for it, as if an outsider committed the murder he left the stuff behind him, and if he went to murder it was done for the pure sake of murder. The jury did not need to worry about that point. That brought them to the suicide theory. They had to consider whether the deceased deliberately lay down, tied the waistbelt round her neck and twisted it tight with the brush. His Lordship did not attach much importance to the evidence of blood, and thought the jury could make up their mind that death was due to strangulation, which in all probability was due to murder and not suicide. The motive for murder seemed to him stronger than the one for suicide. If there was a reasonable doubt, such a doubt as ordinary common-sense men of the world could call a doubt, then the prisoner was entitled to the benefit of it and they would let him go.

The jury did not ask any questions but retired at 12.58. They returned in six minutes.

The Registrar—Gentlemen of the jury, are you agreed upon your verdict?

The Foreman (Mr. E. A. Ram)—We are.

Are you unanimous?—Yes.

Do you find the prisoner guilty or not guilty?—Guilty.

His Lordship (to prisoner)—Have you anything further to add to what you have already said?

Adsetts—No, Sir.

His Lordship—William Hall Adsetts. The jury have unanimously found you guilty of murder upon the clearest evidence that ever came before me since I have been a judge. Considerable time has passed since August 4 and you have had plenty of time for consideration. I have no doubt that some time or other your thoughts were extremely unpleasant ones, and I do not wish to add to that unpleasantness by any words of mine. I shall simply confine myself to passing sentence upon you.

After placing the black cap upon his head, His Lordship continued:—The sentence of the Court is that you be taken hence to the place from whence you came and thence to the place of execution and there you shall be hanged by the neck until you are dead and your body shall be buried in such place as the Governor may direct, and may the Lord have mercy on your soul.

Adsetts, who listened to the sentence with drooping head, did not utter a sound, and was escorted from the dock, a large crowd outside waiting to see his departure.

Thursday, October 24th.

IN CRIMINAL JURISDICTION.

BEFORE MR. A. G. WISE (ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE).

FORGERY.

Cheng Hing was indicted on the charges of forging a cheque on the Hongkong and Shanghai Bank for \$1167 purporting to be drawn by one F. J. Kanga in favour of one, Thong Mau Eger, and with offering and uttering the same. Defendant pleaded guilty on both counts.

His Lordship—Is anything known by the police about this man? I have read the depositions, and see he was in a position of trust to some extent.

The Attorney-General—Yes.

His Lordship (to accused)—I have read the papers and find you are a servant in a position of some trust, and I think I saw by the depositions that you read and write English. It

is necessary that you should not be able to exercise that talent for sometime. You are sentenced to three years hard labour on each count, concurrently.

ROBBERY AND RECEIVING.

Cheung Kin, Chan Sam and Cheung Tsun-po were indicted on charges of robbery and receiving. Prisoners denied the charges, and the following jury was empanelled:—E. Owen (foreman), S. A. Ahmet, J. Marzies, E. A. Costa, E. J. Chapman, C. B. Hayward and P. Buckle.

Hon. Mr. W. Rees Davies, Attorney-General, instructed by Mr. G. E. Morrell, from the Crown Solicitor's office, prosecuted, and Mr. G. E. Morrell, from A. Jackson (of Messrs. Johnson, Stokes and Master) was retained for the defence.

The Attorney-General stated that the prisoners at the bar were before the Court on an information charging them on the first count with robbery with violence, and on the second with being in possession of stolen property. Regarding the second count, he pointed out that if the jury were not satisfied they were guilty of the robbery, then it was open to them to find the prisoners guilty of being in receipt of stolen property unless they could give a reasonable account of how they became possessed of it. The robbery took place at Takmun in the New Territory on the night of the 16th September. A woman named Cheung Sap-yat was living in a house there with her daughter-in-law. On the night in question the two women heard a noise, and saw five men enter the house through a skylight. The prosecutrix identified one man only—the second defendant. She would say that two were armed with knives, and the second defendant threatened to stab her to death if she made a noise. She saw all the robbers break open some boxes and take away some clothing. The mother-in-law spoke definitely to all three prisoners whom she identified as being with other two men who entered the house. A search was made at the houses of the three prisoners, and some of the property stolen that night was found in possession of the first and third defendant, but none was found in the house of the second. The case was one purely of identity, and it would be for the jury to be satisfied as to whether the prisoners were there that night. Not being satisfied as to the evidence of identity, could the prisoners then give a reasonable account of how they became possessed of the stolen property?

Evidence was called, and the case adjourned.

Friday, October 25th.

IN CRIMINAL JURISDICTION.

BEFORE MR. A. G. WISE (ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE).

ROBBERY AND RECEIVING.

The hearing of the charges of robbery and of being in possession of stolen property preferred against Cheung Kin, Chan Sam and Cheung Tsun-po was concluded. The Attorney-General, Hon. Mr. W. Rees Davies, instructed by Mr. G. E. Morrell from the Crown Solicitor's Office, prosecuted, and Mr. H. G. Calthrop, instructed by Mr. A. Jackson (of Messrs. Johnson, Stokes and Master) appeared for the prisoners.

For the defence Mr. Calthrop first called the prisoners.

Cheung Kin said he had heard the name Takmun but he had never been there. He was ill on July 16th, and did not leave the house. He knew a woman named Han Yeung. She practised medicine.

His Lordship—Did she practise on him?

Mr. Calthrop—I don't know that she practised on him, but she did something.

Proceeding, prisoner said he was arrested at midnight on September 16th. He had not seen either of the female witnesses called by the Crown before he saw them at the Tai Po Police Station.

Cross-examined—Prisoner did not know whether there was a wharf in Takmun as he had never been there. He was ill for about 20 days in July.

What was the matter with you?—I don't know, but I was confined to my bed.

Was the illness kleptomania; that means a mania for stealing?—No, nothing like that.

Did you see a doctor?—No, I saw my doctress.

That is the woman you named?—Yes.

A jacket on exhibit was produced, and prisoner said it was his father's.

That's a woman's jacket isn't it?—No, he made it for himself in case of death.

And does a man usually attire himself in a woman's garments when he dies?—I don't know, but he ordered it.

Another jacket was produced which prisoner said was also his father's.

Was he also going to put that on when he died?—Yes.

Your father has gone to the country, and is not coming here to state that he had these clothes made to wear when he died?—He was in Hongkong, but I don't know whether he is still here.

Still another jacket was produced, which prisoner said was also his father's.

Your father had rather a large wardrobe, hadn't he?—Not very many pieces of clothing.

Cheung Tsun-po, the third prisoner, was next called, and denied being at Takmun on July 16th. He was then at home with his sick brother.

Cross-examined—Prisoner was at home praying for his brother on July 16th.

Your brother got better the next day, did he?—Yes, he was a little better on the following day.

The Attorney-General—I'd like the jury to see those jackets, my Lord. I don't know whether they are women's jackets or not.

Mr. Calthrop—You are not an expert in Chinese dress.

His Lordship—I don't know whether the jury are!

Hau Yeung said she went about making prayers and chin obinuing Joss at the request of people. The wife of the first prisoner sent for witness to go to her house, as the father of her child was ill. She saw the prisoner, who was too weak to move about, and prayed for him.

Cross-examined—You are a doctor then, are you?—No, I am not a doctor, but I go about making prayers.

The Attorney-General—A sort of Christian Scientist, my Lord, I think.

Do you keep an account of the visits you pay to different houses?—I am not a shopkeeper, so I have no need to keep books.

Do you receive pay for your services?—Yes, and rich families have to give me a little more than poor families. For a poor family I would pray for even two cents.

Have you any objection to telling me what you were paid for your services to the first prisoner?—Eight cents.

For three days service?—Yes.

Chau Sam, the second prisoner, denied ever being at Takmun. The first time he saw the women who bore witness against him was at the Taipo Police Station.

After hearing further evidence the jury retired, returning into Court two minutes afterwards, when they found the prisoner guilty. On the first count his Lordship sentenced each of the three to three years' imprisonment with hard labour, and on the second count he sentenced the first and third prisoners to two years' imprisonment with hard labour, their sentences to run concurrent.

ALLEGED MANSLAUGHTER.

Mamet Ullah, Barker Khan and Peer Bux were arraigned on the charge of manslaughter. Prisoners pleaded not guilty, and the following jury was empanelled;—C. W. Longuet, T. Grimshaw, A. G. Coppin, C. E. Libeaud, A. M. McDougall, J. Blake and R. Innes.

The Attorney-General, instructed by Mr. G. E. Morrell, from the Crown Solicitor's Office, prosecuted, Sir Henry Berkeley, K.C., who was instructed by Mr. R. D. Atkinson (of Messrs. Deacon, Looker and Deacon), being retained for the defence.

The Attorney-General informed his Lordship and the gentlemen of the jury that the three accused were charged with the manslaughter of a Chinaman named Li Chi at Cheungshawan, New Kowloon, on August 22nd. The first and second accused were in the employ of the third. Close to their house was a wall, made for the use of the farmers in the neigh-

bourhood, and which had been used by them, according to the Attorney-General's instructions, for many years. The accused had been trying for sometime to prevent people using this wall, apparently claiming that it belonged to their house exclusively. On the evening of the 22nd August the deceased went to the wall to draw water, and the third defendant stopped and assaulted him, after which he called upon the first and second to help him. The first accused, in a struggle, hit the deceased on the head with a bamboo carrying pole, knocking him senseless. According to the evidence all three accused assaulted the deceased. A report of the occurrence was made to the Police Station at Shamsunipo, and the first and second accused were arrested the same day, the third man being arrested on the following day. The deceased was removed to the Government Civil Hospital in an unconscious condition, and died early on the morning of the next day from an effusion of blood over the brain caused by external violence, the doctor said in the form of a blunt weapon. Counsel assumed, from the evidence taken before the Magistrate, that the defence would be that it was done in self-defence.

Evidence for the prosecution was called, and the further hearing adjourned.

IN SUMMARY JURISDICTION.

BEFORE MR. H. H. J. GOMPERTZ (ACTING PUISNE JUDGE).

AN ABSCONDING DEBTOR.

In an action brought by Messrs. Goldring and Barlow against Lam Wai-cho, Mr. F. W. Goldring stated that Lam Chuk, formerly in the service of the plaintiffs, had absconded with certain monies. He was guarantee under a bond by his father, who was being sued. Since Lam Chuk absconded the father had sent down \$200 in twenty cent pieces from the country and the outstanding balance was \$536.00. Lam Wai-cho was at present in the Colony and admitted the debt. Judgment was given for plaintiffs with costs.

THE DEBTORS' PHONOGRAPH.

R. H. Mahomed sued the Sze Cheong Lung for \$30, cost of a phonograph. The manager of the defendant firm denied responsibility stating that the phonograph had been sold to another firm which had since dissolved. Plaintiff pointed out one of the partners to whom he sold the phonograph, and judgment was given for him with costs.

A SHANGHAI JUBILEE.

THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

The fiftieth anniversary of the first meeting of the North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society was celebrated on October 16th by a Jubilee Meeting in the Society's hall at Shanghai. There was a very large attendance of members and their friends. Sir Pelham Warren, K.C.M.G., President of the Society, was in the chair, and supporting him on the platform were the Rt. Rev. Bishop Moule, D.D., Mr. H. B. Morse, and Mr. Thomas W. Kingsmill, Vice-Presidents of the Society. There were also present the Shanghai Taotai, Taotai Wang, representing the Nanking Viceroy, Mr. J. Menarini, Dr. Stanley, Dr. F. E. Hinckley, General Meany, Dr. Hawks Pott, Dr. Schermer, the Rev. A. J. Walker and others.

The Chairman said—It gives me great pleasure to welcome you, Ladies and Gentlemen, here to assist at the celebration of our Jubilee. I regret that my connexion with the North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society being comparatively recent I am not in a position to give you more than a brief, a very brief sketch of the foundation of the Society and of its progress up to the present date, leaving to others more competent the task of filling in the picture of which I can only give you the bare outlines.

The first meeting of our Society was held fifty years ago to-day—on October 16, 1857. Dr. Elijah Bridgman was the first President and delivered an inaugural address in which he indicated the field of study of the society—natural history, physics, geography, ethnology, history, the Chinese political system and government law, foreign relations, philology and literature. Dr. Bridgman, the first editor of the

"Chinese Repository," was welcomed to Canton by Dr. Morrison, the first English missionary to come to China, and linked the work represented by the "Repository" with the work of the new society, i.e., our Society. Our Society arose during the storm and stress of the Taiping Rebellion, when Admiral Seymour was preparing to bombard Canton. Trade at Shanghai never ceased. Two years later Peking was taken by the British and French forces. It was during this period of commotion and political unrest that our Society was founded with the peaceful object of conducting research into things Chinese. Dr. Benjamin Hobson, Dr. William Muirhead and Dr. Griffith John were among the original members and Dr. Edkins was the first secretary. Fifty years ago to-night (October 16, 1857) the first paper was read by Sir Fred. W. Nicolson, Bart., Captain of the Pique. The subject was The Law of Storms.

The original name of the Society was The Literary and Scientific Society of Shanghai. But the Chinese scholars on the Council of the Society, Alexander Wylie, Dr. Griffith John, Dr. William Muirhead, Dr. D. J. MacGowan, Sir Harry Parkes, Dr. Benjamin Hobson and Sir Walter Medhurst exercised their influence for affiliation with the Royal Asiatic Society. As a result we joined the Royal Asiatic Society and secured a sisterly relationship with the Indian, the Straits and the Japanese branches of the Asiatic Society of London. The work of our Society has also been carried out in conjunction with that of the kindred societies of Berlin and Paris and the American Oriental Society.

The functions of our Society are: (1) the investigation of subjects connected with China and the neighbouring countries; (2) the holding of meetings for the reading and discussion of papers; (3) the issue of a journal and other publications, and (4) the maintenance of a library and museum.

The Journal was published from the earliest days of the Society and has appeared year by year until the present time.

The library largely owed its origin to the purchase of that of Alexander Wylie, who was never weary of collecting books about China and of mastering their contents.

The museum was started in 1874 by a grant from the Recreation Fund and was assisted in 1876 by public subscriptions, as a result of the appeal of Mr. W. H. Medhurst. It has been carried on since that time with the help of the Shanghai Municipal Council, which has made yearly grants for its up-keep.

The present building of our Society was erected on land granted by the British Government in 1863, but is now in a very dilapidated condition. A new building is essential for the continued growth of the Society. An arrangement is being made with the Municipal Council, whereby it is hoped a new building may be possible in this central position, which will be a public building for the use of the residents of Shanghai, and which will accommodate our Society, the Shanghai Museum, the Library of the Society and the Public Library and be a centre for the intellectual life of this great commercial and progressive community.

Addresses were given also by Mr. H. B. Morse ("our contributors") Rev. Bishop Moule, D.D. (Some features of the development of China during the past forty years") and Mr. Thos. W. Kingsmill ("Contributions to our knowledge of China from Western Sources").

In the course of his interesting and very lengthy paper, Mr. Morse said: In these notes I have generally avoided particular mention of those who are still at work in China, and have devoted my remarks more especially to the veterans in sinology. We have, however, still among us in the flesh one of these veterans, to whom I must make more than a passing reference. Thomas W. Kingsmill was elected a member of this Society on March 7, 1854, and was elected to the Council on January 10, 1866. Since that date, over forty years ago, he has been continuously, except during occasional absences from Shanghai, an office bearer of the Society, as Councillor, Treasurer, Secretary, Curator of the Museum, Vice-President and (in 1877 and 1878) President; and a year ago the Society conferred on him its highest honour, electing him, while still a resident of Shanghai, an Honorary Member. His first paper, read before

the Society forty-three years ago, was on the geology of Kuangtung; in the interval from that date till now he has contributed to the Journal, papers on mineralogy, on archaeology, on history, on philology, on Tibet, on "The Chinese System of Family Relationship and its Aryan Affinities" and "On the Origin and Connexions of the Solar and Lunar Zodiacs"; while his inaugural address as President in 1877 on "The Border Lands of Geology and History" marks the industrious student, the careful observer and the cautious scholar, and stands as a model for inaugural addresses of other Presidents. While thus, by his creative work, serving the purpose for which the Society exists he has furthered that purpose in no less degree by his criticisms of unsubstantiated or ill-considered theories advanced by others; and, beyond this, has added to the vitality of our proceedings and of our Journal by the active criticisms by which many of his propositions have been met. For over forty years he has laboured at the oar, and long may the time be deferred when he will find his rest.

FRENCH CAPITALISTS IN JAPAN.

(FROM OUR CORRESPONDENT.)

EXTENSIVE INVESTMENTS.

Tokyo, October 6th.

With the arrival a few weeks ago of several French and Belgian financiers a new chapter has been opened in connection with the introduction of foreign capital to Japan. The syndicate—or French syndicate as it is widely known in the Japanese press—is now in Tokyo making investigations in several directions, but more particularly in regard to the projected French bank to be established in Tokyo—an ambitious and enterprising scheme that will be watched with interest by commercial men throughout the East.

The capital that this syndicate commands and is prepared to invest in industrial and other undertakings in Japan makes the visit one of the most important commercial events since the close of the war, and providing that present and future negotiations with the Japanese authorities go smoothly the industry of the country in several branches will receive great impetus.

Of the several concerns with which the syndicate is connected that are either in working order or soon to be under way the President is Mr. R. Loonen, a young French financier who has been here some five years and is thoroughly well acquainted with the general conditions. This gentleman may be described as the active head and guide in Japan to the other members of the syndicate, all of whom are practically new to the country, which consists of the following—

- Banque de Paris.
- Banque Union Parisienne.
- Bank d'Outremer, Brussels.
- Cie. Internationale d'Orient, Brussels.
- Mr. R. Loonen, Tokyo.
- Mr. Dalziel, London.

The concerns now in working order or projected with which the syndicate of Mr. Loonen is closely connected are as follows:—

- 1.—Royal Brush Co., Osaka. Capital, paid up, 300,000 yen, of which 3.5 are French, 1.5 English, and 1/5 American.
- 2.—Le Syndicat Industriel d'Extrême-Orient, Half French and Belgian capital.
- 3.—Oriental Forest and Lumber Co., Ltd. Capital, paid up, 950,000 yen, of which 4.6 are French, 1/6 Japanese, and 1/6 English.
- 4.—Oriental Glass Manufacturing Co., Ltd. Capital paid up, 1,500,000 yen, of which 4 is Belgian, 3 French, and 3 Japanese.
- 5.—Oriental Compressed Co., Ltd., Capital, paid up, 300,000 yen, of which 2.3 are French and 1/3 Japanese.
- 6.—Oriental Rubber Manufacturing Co., Ltd. Capital, paid up, 1,000,000 yen, of which 4 is English, 3 French, and 3 Japanese.
- 7.—Special Syndicate Bank to be established in Tokyo, with a capital of £2,000,000 sterling exclusively French.
- 8.—Docks at Moji.

Of the above the Royal Brush Co. was established by Mr. Loonen several years ago and has since been enlarged and transferred to the syndicate. This undertaking produces all sorts and qualities of brushes and has a substantial domestic and export trade.

The forestry company began operations about a year and a half ago, and has forest concessions in several parts of Japan, as well as an up-to-date saw mill equipment, this being the first concern of the kind to take the place of the primitive native methods of reducing timber for the market.

In a few weeks the glass manufactory at Osaka will be completed and ready for business. These works, in the extent of ground covered, will be the largest factory buildings of any description in Japan, the government iron works at Wakamatsu excepted. At present there is not a single bottle manufactory in the country, although consumption by the breweries, &c., is growing enormously year by year. Nearly a hundred thousand bottles are annually imported, and it is not impossible therefore that in a few years the Osaka company will be able to check this import and at the same time build up an export trade on the continent. The prospects of this concern seem particularly bright.

What is called the "compressed" company will exploit a new method of laying building foundations. The compressed foundations will consist of concrete, &c., laid by special machinery now on the way from France. There seems to be room for such an invention in Tokyo, specially if the cost is not prohibitive. In the Kojimachi section of the city, where the government offices and head quarters of large commercial concerns are situated, fine buildings in foreign style are the rule and there is ample room for expansion.

THE PROJECTED BANK.

The most interesting of the syndicate's schemes, however, is the French bank that is to be established in Tokyo with a capital of £2,000,000 sterling. This, unlike any other foreign bank, will have its headquarters in the capital and it is designed to do business with the capital. There is little doubt that the scheme will see actuality, as the projectors find authorities favourably inclined and are more-over backed up by influential Japanese financiers, such as Baron Shibusawa and Mr. Okura. It may here be stated that a minority of Japanese will sit on all the boards of the syndicate. The bank scheme is Mr. Loonen's idea and following upon the formation of the Anglo-Japanese Bank, whose headquarters are at Yokohama, its career will be watched with the greatest interest. With the extension of Tokyo's international importance in financial and commercial matters there seems to be a sound *raison d'être* for such an enterprise.

THE PORT OF MOJI.

A project that has not yet gone beyond the paper stage is one that may prove by far the most extensive of the syndicate's investments in Japan. The importance of the geographical situation of Moji and the way the port is handicapped by the strong Shimono-seki current are too well known to need any further reference here. Government has been prevented by the war and other considerations from embarking on the undertaking of improving the anchorage of the port, but is now considering the subject afresh, in connection with the policy of improving all harbours where necessary.

The French syndicate is concerning itself solely with providing docking facilities at Moji, and these once obtained the improvement of the anchorage is reduced in importance, as vessels would not then find it necessary to anchor in the straits. The plan under consideration is to build the docks some short distance from the present business or maritime centre of the port round a bend of the coast, where vessels entering would escape the current, which, as is well known, is so strong that large vessels do not stop at Moji, greatly militating against Moji's development both in coal exporting and in general trade. The French scheme would remove the town in a measure, but would greatly benefit the port, and some such improvement is absolute necessity if Moji is ever to justify its fine situation as one of the great maritime gateways of Japan. It is the nearest port to Korea and the most convenient to vessels bound for North China. Hence, with proper harbour or docking facilities the large percentage of vessels now passing through, including all liners, would stay to coal and trade to the immense advantage of the port. A few years ago a foreign and Japanese syndicate was con-

cerned in a drydock scheme for Moji, but for some reason or other this fell through. The plans of the French syndicate seem more practical, aiming as they do at the direct benefit of the port and there is therefore all the more likelihood of their success.

The syndicate has thus an extensive programme of work in Japan and part is already accomplished. In several of their ventures the co-operation or at least the countenance of the Government authorities will be necessary—and such assistance in Japan is particularly advantageous. In this respect, as before stated, the financiers have met with no obstacles, and under these favourable conditions the interests of the syndicate may be greatly extended, as, needless to say, the capital of such an influential group is practically unlimited.

OPIUM DECREES.

The *North-China Daily News* dates the following:—Peking, October 10th:

Decree with reference to the tardiness in which many of the princes, nobles and high officials of Peking and the provinces have been guilty in getting rid of the opium-smoking habit. It will be remembered that a special decree was promulgated some time ago allowing opium-smoking officials the privilege of reporting themselves, so that a certain limit of time may be given them to get rid of the obnoxious habit. This is a clear proof of the clemency and sympathy of the Throne for those who have the habit, and each and all of those concerned ought to be deeply grateful therefor and do their best to obey Us. Furthermore, We granted a limit of six months to officials to get rid of this habit, also that, at the end of this time, an investigation should be made to see who had obeyed these Our commands. Now We find that, amongst others, Kuei Pin, Prince of Jui, 1st Order; Teai Kung, Prince of Chuang, 1st Order, and Lu Paohuang and Chen Min-kan, President and Vice-President, respectively, of the Censorate, have, so far, not been able to get rid of the habit, as their appearance clearly shows to Us. This seems to Us that they have treated Our commands in this respect with unbecoming levity so that if We should punish the delinquents severely, it is only what they deserve, and they need not be pitied. But We like to extend the Imperial Mercy and have consideration of the fact that they have been slaves of the habit for some years. Let them, therefore, obey the regulations that were promulgated in this matter and let them resign their posts for the time being, in order to pay their sole attention to the eradication of any craving they may have for the drug, and let some one be appointed to do their respective duties ad interim. As soon as they have abandoned the habit they will be allowed to return, each to his former post. As for the civil and military officials in the provinces, if only allowed six months to do so, it is to be feared that all will not be able to obey Our Edict. We, therefore, command, as an extraordinary Act of Mercy, that, beginning from the day of the promulgation of this Our Decree, a further limit of three months be granted in order to enable all officials, high and low, to get rid entirely of their habit. It is to be hoped that all high officials, whether within the Capital, or without will do their utmost to obey Our commands as soon as possible. As for the others, civil and military, those in Peking are to be under the surveillance of the high officials of the various Ministries, while those in the provinces are to be watched by the Tartar Generals, Viceroy, Governors and Manchu Brigadier-Generals of the Tartar Garrisons who are to see that their subordinates obey Our commands in deed and in fact. Let no one be careless or treat them with levity or indifference. Should any lack the willpower to go on with their self-denial, or, being afraid of the difficulties in their path stop midway, so that when the extra limit of time granted by extraordinary Imperial Clemency has come, it finds them still unable to get rid of the baneful habit, they shall be dealt with in accordance with the regulations already approved of by Us, and there shall be no mercy given to delinquents. Let no one say that We have not given him ample time to reform himself.

COMMERCIAL.

SILK.

From Messrs. F. C. Heffer's Report, dated Shanghai, October 18th, 1907:—Telegrams report quiet market at Home and quote Gold Killing in London at 13/9. Raw Silk.—The most important feature in our market has been a decline of fully 3d. in exchange, since my last circular. A small business has been done in Tsatlees at Tls. 20 advance; but on the whole there appears no great desire to buy at these rates. Steam Filatures.—Very little doing. Hand Filatures.—Settlements of 300 bales Crack Chops for America are reported on the Basis of Tls. 820 for M.H.Y. Blue Dragon Extra. Yellow Silks.—A fair business has been done at advancing prices, the market closing firm.

OPIUM.

HONGKONG, October 25th.

Quotations are:—Allowance net to 1 catty.

Malwa New	\$890	to	—	per picul.
Malwa Old	\$940	to	—	do.
Malwa Older	\$980	to	—	do.
Malwa Very Old	\$1030	to	—	do.
Persian Fine Quality	\$700	to	—	do.
Persian Extra Fine	\$750	to	—	do.
Patna New	\$935	to	—	per chest.
Patna Old	\$915	to	—	do.
Benares New	\$890	to	—	do.
Benares Old	\$—	to	—	do.

PIECE GOODS.

Messrs. Noel, Murray & Co.'s Report on the Shanghai Piece Goods Trade, dated Shanghai, 17th October, 1907, states:—The continued decline in Sterling Exchange during the interval, amounting to much as 8 per cent. since the third of this month, has completely demoralised the market. When it is remembered that the great bulk of the stock here, already overburdened with interest and storage charges, is being carried on a sterling basis, the effect on holders is, to say the least, most embarrassing. Time alone will prove what the outlook is to be, but at the moment the outlook is decidedly gloomy. It is useless reiterating the trade has been overdone during the last few years, and the simply bull luck that, through fortuitous circumstances, enabled it to endure for so long. It was impossible to continue at the high pressure it was attempted to carry on at without abatement, and now the consequences must be faced. Importers and bankers must pull together as much as possible, the latter remembering that they originally insisted on bills against imports being renewed on a sterling basis, thus more than confirming the opinion that exchange was unlikely to decline. A very awkward situation has unfortunately been contracted and it will require great tact to avert disaster. So far as first hand holders are concerned clearances of former purchases are fair on the whole, but experiences differ with the class of goods concerned. Fresh business is out of the question. For goods in stock buyers refuse to renew former offers, and for forward transactions the margin between the ideas of buyers and sellers is now increased to nearly 20 per cent. However, with liberal supplies available at the regular auctions, and which are obtainable at their own prices, caterers to the wants of consumers can well afford to go slow and simply buy from hand to mouth to fill current requirements. Fortunately home prices are keeping up in spite of the decline in cotton, and there seems little inducement to buy, unless it is to keep up the Auction supplies. This system of selling, which has withstood all the vicissitudes of the trade for the last thirty-three years, appears to be the only feasible way of disposing of goods at present, and in spite of the depressed state of the market full quantities are readily saleable without any very violent fluctuation in prices. The only cheering piece of news from the Out Ports is the better prospects for the trade in Newchwang, caused by the rivalry between the Railways whereby the route via that port promises to become more used than the Dalny route. This may be only temporary, but will give the old port a little life and activity before it closes for the winter. Already some orders for fresh supplies have been placed on this market,

chiefly American drills. The Tientsin market is in much the same position as this, the unfortunate holders being badly hit by the drop in exchange. Trade with the River Ports is not altogether unsatisfactory. The railway service is now open between this and Chinkiang, the journey taking six hours. The entirely native built line from this to Hangchow is progressing rapidly, and from latest accounts is expected to be completed by the end of next year, all of which little improvements in the transport service should be conducive to the advancement of trade in future, but the mistake must be avoided of anticipating that improvement too soon. The Manchester manufacturers, although not showing any great weakness on account of the falling off in the demand for India, are evidently in want of orders, but cotton has not declined sufficiently to enable it to meet the views of buyers for this market. Liverpool seems to have been disturbed by conflicting accounts of the crop, and after declining to 6. 52d, for Mid-American recovered to 6.64d. Yesterday the quotation was 6.60d spot and 6.09d for futures, to-day it comes 6.49d for spot. Egyptian is down to even money—10. The Manchester export for this month of Plain Cottons to China was 7,000,000 yards. No changes have been advised in the New York market for Domestic, cotton being quoted 11 cents for January and 11.16 cents for March option, which scarcely confirms report of damage by hail storms. According to some telegrams the Indian cotton crop is expected to be only 70 per cent. of last year's owing to the continued drought. The Yarn market is looking a little firmer for imported spinnings, but operators will not pay the prices demanded now by first hand holders. The bulk of the business done in Indian spinnings during the interval has been amongst the natives, buyers refusing to pay an advance sufficient to cover the decline in exchange. Japanese Spinings have received more attention, and there is some enquiry for local yarns, but at prices that spinners cannot accept, although resales by contractors have been made on the basis of Tls. 37.00 for No. 14s. The last sales by a Mill that we hear of was some ten days ago at Tls. 78.00 for No. 16s. and nothing under that will be entertained with cotton on the rise.

From Messrs. Ilbert & Co.'s Report dated Shanghai, October 18th, 1907:—Again our market has been merely a looker-on while the rapid collapse of exchange has continued without interruption during the interval; and the only thing that has been stimulated by the fall in rates has been the volume of clearances for some of the nearer markets. Outlets at any distance have not yet had the chance of realizing that the opportunity for replacing purchases is now 10 per cent. more distant than was the case at only the beginning of this month, at which time even the gap between "spot" and replacing values was too great to be bridged; the numerous telegrams, however, in place of the usual letter advices, which have been dispatched by native dealers to their various clients in the country may have some effect in stimulating the "spot" demand when inquiry has had an opportunity of returning. A very disturbing factor, affecting local markets generally, has been the extensive speculation in exchange and gold bars carried on for some months between Chinese and some of the Exchange Banks. In former years speculation of this nature was confined to an occasional lapse from conservative business by the gold shops, and when we remember the losses incurred some years ago by some of the Banks indulging in this forward business, we can only wonder at their temerity in again encouraging it, and including in their operations native business hongs regardless of the interests of their Foreign Customers who are in the habit of settling direct all exchange required by their dealers and making any re-adjustment necessary. Recent direct operations can only make merchants very uncertain as to their dealers' position and add an additional risk to business for all concerned. We understand that these transactions aggregated a short time ago a total of some 22,300,000 forward sales to Banks outstanding, so no wonder that when Silver showed a little weakness, the rush by every one to cover knocked down exchange and helped considerably to produce what has resulted in little less than a panic in the Silver market and an almost unprecedented fall in rates here, until the quotation for T. T. was 2/9½ on the 15th instant against 30/½ on the September 28th. Trade cannot flourish under such conditions and we can only hope that operators on both sides are satisfied now to leave such gambling alone and not interfere further with the legitimate trade of the port.

HONGKONG QUOTATIONS.

HONGKONG, 24th October, 1907.

Apricot	\$13.50	to	—
Borax	\$ 15	"	18½
Cassia	\$ 19	"	19½
Cloves	\$ 20	"	33
Camphor	\$100	"	—
Cow Bezoar	\$120	"	130
Fennel Seed	\$ 8	"	—
Galangal	\$ 2	"	4
Grapes	\$ 4	"	4
Kismis	\$ 5	"	6
Glue	\$ 27	"	—
Olibanum	\$ 2	"	13
Oil Sandalwood	\$245	"	350
" Rosa	\$ 50	"	150
" Cassia	\$240	"	—
Raisins	\$ 5	"	6
Senna Leaves	\$ 4	"	9
Sandalwood	\$ 27	"	29
Saltpetre	\$ 10	"	—

MISCELLANEOUS EXPORTS.

Messrs. Arnhold, Karberg & Co's Fortnightly Produce Circular dated Shanghai, 17th October, 1907, has the following:—During the last two weeks the export trade received a strong stimulus through the unprecedented drop in exchange. Although the Chinese were not slow in raising their prices, the decline of about 10 per cent. of silver enabled exporters to close a great many transactions. Gallnuts.—Quotations are firm. There is little demand from Europe. Cowhides.—Season closed. Tobacco.—Samples of this year's crop are liked in Europe and a good business is expected. Feathers.—Stocks are small, but very little interest is shown in Europe. Cotton.—Our market is decidedly firmer. The Japanese are buying freely. Tallow.—Market unchanged. Some few lots have changed hands at good prices. Wood Oil.—Holders are still very firm in view of the reduced stocks. Strawbraid.—Few sales have been effected in Loyeh white and Shansi mottled otherwise the market remains quite.

HANKOW, 17th Oct., 1907.—The prices quoted are for the net shipping weight excluding cost of packing for export:—

	Per picul.
Cowhides, Best Selected	Tls. 34.00
Do. Seconds	" 31.00
Buffalo Hides, Best Selected	" 22.50
Goatskins, untanned, chiefly white	" —
colour	" —
Buffalo Horns, average 3 lbs. each	" —
White China Grass, Wuchang and/or	" —
Poochi	" 10.00
White China Grass, Sinshan and/or Chayu	" 9.00
Green China Grass, Szechuen	" —
Jute	" 4.40
White Vegetable Tallow, Kinchow	" 10.20
White Vegetable Tallow, Pingchew	" —
and/or Macheng	" —
White Vegetable Tallow, Mongyu	" —
Green Vegetable Tallow, Kiyu	" 10.60
Animal Tallow	" 10.50
Gallnuts, usual shape	" 14.50
Gallnuts, plum do.	" 17.80
Tobacco, Tingchow	" —
Tobacco, Wongkong	" —
Turmeric	" —
Sesamum Seed	" 5.60
Sesamum Seed Oil	" —
Wood Oil	" 8.80
Tea Oil	" —

SHARE REPORTS.

Messrs. J. P. Bisset & Co.'s Share Report for the week ending 17th October, 1907, states:—This week has been distinguished for some of the most violent fluctuations we have seen in our share market for some time, notably in Shanghai and Hongkew Wharf shares and in Maatschappij, &c., in Langkats. The effect of the great fall in exchange and the loss occasioned thereby to many of the Native holders of shares has been to throw large quantities of both stock on the market, and the unexpectedness of the movement has unduly depressed all our rates. Banks.—Hongkong and Shanghai Banks. Without actual business having been done, we quote the rates of \$660 and \$650 nominal for old and the new shares respectively. The T.T. rate on London to-day is 2/9½. Ins.—North-China Insurance Co. have buyers at Tls. 74. Shipping.—Shanghai Tug & Lighter Co. Ordinary shares have been placed at Tls. 4½ and the Preference at Tls. 50. Docks and Wharves.—Shanghai Dock and Engineering Co. Ltd. Shares

have dropped still further and are quoted at Tls. 72 for cash and Tls. 74 for December. Persistent selling soon weakened the rates and the next business returned was at Tls. 212½ for December. Still more shares being thrown on the market after Tls. 206 had been done for cash, carried the cash rate to Tls. 202½. A general collapse in forward rates then took place and sales were made at Tls. 210, Tls. 207½ and Tls. 205 December. At closing business has been done at Tls. 202½ December. More transactions took place for March at Tls. 217½ and Tls. 216, but these rates were not maintained and at the close we quote the rate nominally at Tls. 210. Sugars.—No business reported. Mining.—No business reported. Lands.—Shanghai Lands have been placed at Tls. 101. Industrial.—Cotton Shares. There is no business reported this week. Shanghai Gas Shares have been placed at Tls. 107, and there are buyers at this figure. China Flour Mills Shares have changed hands at Tls. 50. Shanghai Ices. Sales have been made at Tls. 12½. Maatschappij, etc., in Langkats. We have to record a sensational and very rapid collapse in this stock during the week. The market opened with a sale for December at Tls. 340, and on the 11th we find shares changed hands at Tls. 325 cash, Tls. 330 October, and Tls. 335 December. A certain weakness set in, which at the end of last week brought the rates down to Tls. 325 cash, and Tls. 330 December. On the 14th cash shares became unsaleable at prevailing rates and the market dropped to Tls. 325 for December and Tls. 327½ for January. On the 15th, although rates were nominally Tls. 320 for December, a great rush of shares on the market were sold without intermediate bargaining at Tls. 300 for cash and Tls. 307½ and Tls. 300 for December. Yesterday this shock was further accentuated and the rate tumbled for cash to Tls. 285 and sales for December at Tls. 295 and Tls. 290. We are glad to report that a sharp reaction then set in and at closing rates are Tls. 300 for cash Tls. 310 for December. Shanghai Sumatras. There are sellers at Tls. 115. Kalumpung Rubbers have sellers at Tls. 56. Miscellaneous.—Business has been of a very trifling character, and rates at closing are as appended below. Loans and Debentures.—We hear of nothing being done.

HONGKONG, 23th October, 1907.—The market has remained fairly steady with a fair business in the first part, but a slackening off towards the latter part of the week. Rates remain without any important change, and the market closes steady. Exchange on London T/T 2/0½, on Shanghai 74.

BANKS.—Hongkong and Shanghai continue steady with sales at \$665 (old) and \$660 (new); the rate in London remains unchanged at £76 for the old, and £75. 10s. for the new shares. Nationals without change or business.

MARINE INSURANCES.—With the exception of North China, which are now quoted at Tls. 72½ ex dividend of 7/6 paid on the 23rd inst., we have nothing to report under this heading.

FIRE INSURANCES.—Hongkong have changed hands during the week at \$300, and Chinas at 86, both closing steady with probable buyers at these rates.

SHIPPING.—Hongkong, Canton and Macao have been in demand during the week at 27½ and 28, and with no shares forthcoming the rate has improved at time of closing to 28½, with sales and buyers. New Star Ferries have improved to 11 with buyers, and Shells have receded to 42/6 without business. We have nothing further to report under this heading.

REFINERIES.—China Sugars have ruled erratic, but the reported incipient firmness at the close of last week was not realized, and the market has ruled dull to weak closing with sellers at 104. Luzons remain unchanged.

MINING.—Paubs have ruled weaker during the week, and with the exception of small sales at 9, we have nothing to report. Chinese Engineerings continue neglected and quiet.

DOCKS, WHARVES AND GODOWNS.—Hongkong and Whampoa Docks have changed hands in small lots at \$102, closing quiet at that rate. Kowloon Wharves and Amoy Docks call for no remarks. Shanghai Docks, after falling to 72 in Shanghai, close firmer at 74. Hongkong Wharves have declined in Shanghai to 195, chiefly owing, we understand, to weak speculative Chinese holders in Shanghai.

LANDS, HOTELS AND BUILDINGS.—With the exception of a few sales of Humphreys at \$10½ we have nothing to report under this heading.

COTTON MILLS.—Ewos have fallen to 56 in Shanghai. Other cottons remaining unchanged.

MISCELLANEOUS.—China Porcelains have been placed during the week at 10½ and 10, closing with buyers at the latter rate. China Providents have ruled quiet at \$8.90, with small sales. A circular from the General Managers to shareholders intimates that a meeting is called to authorise the issue of the unissued shares of this Company, i.e. 100,000 shares. Cements have been dealt in to some extent at 11½ and 11½, closing with sellers at the latter rate. China Lights and Electrics, also Rops close in demand at quotations without any business to report.

Quotations are as follows:—

COMPANY.	PAID UP	QUOTATIONS.
Alhambra	\$200	Nominal
Banks—		
Hongkong & Shanghai	\$125	\$665, sales \$660, sales Ln. 276 Ln. 275.10, new i.
National B. of China	26	\$51
Bell's Asbestos E. A.	12s. 6d.	\$6½
China-Borneo Co.	\$12	\$10, buyers
China Light & P. Co.	\$10	\$6, buyers
China Provident	\$10	\$9, buyers
Cotton Mills—		
Ewo	Tls. 50	Tls. 56
Hongkong	\$10	\$10½, sellers
International	Tls. 75	Tls. 53
Laou Kung Mow	Tls. 100	Tls. 90
Soychee	Tls. 500	Tls. 280
Dairy Farm	\$6	\$16.75, sellers
Docks & Wharves—		
H. & K. Wharf & G.	\$50	\$67½, sellers
H. & W. Dock	\$50	\$102, buyers
New Amoy Dock	\$6½	\$11, sellers
Shanghai Dock and Eng. Co., Ltd.	Tls. 100	Tls. 74.
Shanghai & H. Wharf	Tls. 100	Tls. 195
Fenwick & Co., Geo.	\$25	\$10, sellers
G. Island Cement	\$10	\$11½, sellers
Hongkong & C. Gas	\$10	\$175, buyers
Hongkong Electric	\$10	\$144, buyers
Hongkong Hotel Co.	\$50	\$100, buyers
Hongkong Ice Co.	\$25	\$240
Hongkong Rope Co.	\$10	\$25½, buyers
Insurances—		
Canton	\$50	\$270, sellers, c.d.
China Fire	\$20	\$86, sales
China Traders	\$25	\$90, buyers
Hongkong Fire	\$50	\$300, sales & buy.
North China	25	Tls. 72½, x.d.
Union	\$100	\$765, buyers
Yangtze	\$60	\$170, sellers
Land and Buildings—		
H'kong Land Invest.	\$100	\$96
Humphrey's Estate	\$10	\$10½, sales
Kowloon Land & B.	\$30	\$36 sellers
Shanghai Land	Tls. 50	Tls. 101
West Point Building	\$50	\$48
Mining—		
Charbonnages	Fcs. 250	\$470, buyers
Raubs	18/10	\$9
Peak Tramways	\$10	\$12, buyers
Philippine Co.	\$1	\$2, (new) buy.
	\$10	\$5
Refineries—		
China Sugar	\$100	\$104, sellers
Luzon Sugar	\$100	\$21, sellers
Steamship Companies		
China and Manila	\$25	\$15, buyers
Douglas Steamship	\$50	\$37½
H., Canton & M.	\$15	\$28½, sales & buy.
Indo-China S. N. Co.	25	\$41, Prefd., sel. \$29, Defd., sellers
Shell Transport Co	21	\$26
Star Ferry	\$10	\$21, buyers
Do. New	\$5	\$11, buyers
South China M. Post	\$25	\$22, sellers
Steam Laundry Co.	\$5	\$6, sellers
Stores & Dispensaries		
Campbell, M. & Co	\$10	\$20, sellers
Powell & Co., Wm.	\$10	\$5½
Watkins	\$10	\$24
Watson & Co., A. S.	\$10	\$11
United Asbestos	\$4	\$10
Do. Founders	\$10	\$150, buyers
Union Waterboat Co.	\$10	\$12, sellers

VERNON & SMYTH, Brokers.

TONNAGE.

HONGKONG, 18th October.—Freights continue dull. From Saigon to this, 10 cents nominal; to Philippines, 2 small carriers fixed for part cargoes at 24 cents and 26 cents; to 1 port North Coast Java, a medium sized boat closed at 18 cents; to South Coast Japan, 23 cents. From North Coast Java to Hongkong, no demand; to South Coast Japan, one fixture reported at 10/8 per ton. From Iloilo to Yokohama, 30 cents per picul. From Tsintau to Manila, a cargo of hay has been placed at \$6,750 lump sum. From Newchwang to Canton, several fixtures at 22 cents to 24 cents. From Moji to Hongkong, \$1.45 per ton, last; to Singapore, \$1.70; to Canton, \$2.00. The following are the settlements:—

Macduff—British steamer, 1,882 tons, Moji to Hongkong, \$1.45 per ton.
M. S. Dollar—British steamer, 2,674 tons, Kuchinotzu or Moji to Hongkong, \$1.40 per ton.
Szechuen—British steamer, 1,143 tons, Newchwang to Canton (20/22,000), 22 cents per picul.
Kwangse—British steamer, 1,223 tons, Newchwang to Canton (24,000), 22 cents per picul.
Solstad—Norwegian steamer, 897 tons, Newchwang (24,000), 22 cents per picul.
Standard—Norwegian steamer, 894 tons, Newchwang to Canton (25,000), 22 cents per picul.
Progress—German steamer, 799 tons, Newchwang to Canton, 23½ cents per picul.
Kiceiyang—British steamer, 1,044 tons, Newchwang to Canton, 24 cents per picul.
Kjeld—Norwegian steamer, 910 tons, Tsintau to Manila (Hay), \$6,750 lump sum.
Fiume—German steamer, 838 tons, Iloilo to Yokohama, 30 cents per picul.
Spir—Norwegian steamer, 870 tons, Saigon to 1 port Philippines (24,000), 24 cents per picul.
Ule—Norwegian steamer, 884 tons, Saigon to 1 port Philippines (20,000), 26 cents per picul.
Profit—Norwegian steamer, 715 tons, Saigon to Singapore, \$3,000 lump sum.
Signal—German steamer, 907 tons, Saigon to Hongkong, 10 cents per picul.

EXCHANGE.

MONDAY, October 28th.

ON LONDON.—	
Telegraphic Transfer	2/0½
Bank Bills, on demand	2/0½
Bank Bills, at 30 days' sight	2/0½
Bank Bills at 4 months' sight	2/1
Credits, at 4 months' sight	2/1½
Documentary Bills, 4 months' sight	2/1½
ON PARIS.—	
Bank Bills, on demand	257
Credits 4 months' sight	263
ON GERMANY.—On demand	
ON NEW YORK.—	
Bank Bills, on demand	19½
Credits, 60 days' sight	50½
ON BOMBAY.—	
Telegraphic Transfer	152½
Bank, on demand	153½
ON CALCUTTA.—	
Telegraphic Transfer	152½
Bank on demand	153½
ON SHANGHAI.—	
Bank, at sight	74
Private, 30 days' sight	74½
ON YOKOHAMA.—On demand	
ON MANILA.—On demand	100½
ON SINGAPORE.—On demand	13½ p.m.
ON BATAVIA.—On demand	123
ON HAI PHONG.—On demand	4½ p.m.
ON SAIGON.—On demand	4 p.m.
ON BANGKOK.—On demand	72½
SOVEREIGNS, Bank's Buying Rate	\$ 9.85
GOLD LEAF, 100 fine, per tael	\$51.10
BAR SILVER, per oz	28

SUBSIDIARY COINS.

		per cent
Chinese	2) cents pieces	\$4.55 discount
"	10 "	5.23 "
Hongkong	20 "	4.15 "
"	10 "	5.00 "

FREIGHTS.

From Hankow per Conference Steamers.—To London and Northern Continental ports 45/- per ton of 40 c. ft. plus river freight. To Genoa, Marseilles or Havre 45/- per ton of 40 c. ft. plus river freight. To New York (via Suez) General Cargo 30/- per ton of 40 c. ft. plus river freight. To New York (via Suez)—Tea 37/6 per ton of 40 c. ft. plus river freight. To New York (Overland) per carload, Tea G. \$1½ cents per lb. gross; less than carload Tea G. \$1½ cents per lb. gross plus river freight. To Shanghai.—Tea and General Cargo. Tls. 1.60 to 1.80 per ton, weight or measurement.

SHIPPING.

ARRIVALS AND DEPARTURES SINCE LAST MAIL.

October—

ARRIVALS.

- 17, Chihli, British str., from Haiphong.
 17, Oceana, British str., from Shanghai.
 17, Paklat, German str., from Bangkok.
 17, Tsurugisan M., Jap. str., from Kuchinotzu.
 18, Acara, British str., from New York.
 18, Denbighshire, British str., from London.
 18, Laertes, British str., from Saigon.
 18, Montague, British str., from Vancouver.
 18, Nijni Norgorod, Rus. str., from Shanghai.
 18, Numantia, German str., from Portland.
 18, Sithonia, German str., from Singapore.
 18, Taming, British str., from Manila.
 18, Tjikini, Dutch str., from Amoy.
 19, Belgravia, German str., from Hamburg.
 19, Benlomond, British str., from London.
 19, Bourbon, French str., from Saigon.
 19, Chipshing, British str., from Tientsin.
 19, Hupeh, British str., from Haiphong.
 19, Kwanglee, Chinese str., from Shanghai.
 19, Mortlake, British str., from Fremantle.
 20, Chinkiang, British str., from Newchwang.
 20, E. of Japan, British str., from Vancouver.
 20, Frithjof, Norwegian str., from Swatow.
 20, Haiching, British str., from Coast Ports.
 20, Hue, French str., from K. C. Wan.
 20, Huichow, British str., from Tientsin.
 20, Oriol, British str., from Kuchinotzu.
 20, Pandertia, British str., from Tientsin.
 20, Tosa Maru, Japanese str., from Seattle.
 21, Atholl, British str., from Singapore.
 21, Deucalion, British str., from Amoy.
 21, Empire, British str., from Kobe.
 21, Hailan, French str., from Hoihow.
 21, Hanoi, French str., from Haiphong.
 21, Hong B-e, British str., from Singapore.
 21, Keong Wai, German str., from Bangkok.
 21, Korea, Am. str., from San Francisco.
 21, Michael Jepsen, Ger. str., from Hoihow.
 21, Onsaug, British str., from Moji.
 21, Rubi, British str., from Manila.
 22, Gulf of Venice, British str., from Manila.
 22, Hilary, German str., from Java.
 22, J. Diederichsen, Ger. str., from Pakhoi.
 22, Japan, British str., from Calcutta.
 22, Kleist, German str., from Yokohama.
 22, Kumeric, British str., from Manila.
 22, Meefoo, Chinese str., from Shanghai.
 22, Petchaburi, German str., from Bangkok.
 22, Stettin, British str., from Singapore.
 22, Volute, British str., from Balik Papan.
 23, Daijin Maru, Jap. str., from Tamsui.
 23, Haitan, British str., from Coast Ports.
 23, Kowloon, German str., from Moji.
 23, Kwongsang, British str., from Shanghai.
 23, Loongsang, British str., from Manila.
 23, Manila, British str., from Japan.
 23, Prometheus, Norw. str., from Bangkok.
 23, Suavia, German str., from Moji.
 23, Taishan, British str., from Saigon.
 23, Yetorfu Maru, Jap. str., from Moji.
 24, C. Diederichsen, Ger. str., from Haiphong.
 24, Dagny, Norwegian str., from Dalny.
 24, Vancouver, British str., from Newcastle.
- October— DEPARTURES.
- 18, Antiochus, British str., for Singapore.
 18, Arcadia, British str., for Shanghai.
 18, Chowfa, German str., for Bangkok.
 18, Choysang, British str., for Shanghai.
 18, Glenearu, British str., for Kuchinotzu.
 18, Haimun, British str., for Swatow.
 18, Helene, German str., for Hoihow.
 18, Hongkong, French str., for Haiphong.
 18, Istok, Austrian str., for Bombay.
 18, Kaifong, British str., for Iloilo.
 18, Mathilde, German str., for Hoihow.
 18, Soshu Maru, Japanese str., for Swatow.
 18, Triumph, German str., for Haiphong.
 18, Yuensang, British str., for Manila.
 19, Childar, Norwegian str., for Swatow.
 19, Denbighshire, British str., for Shanghai.
 19, Hitachi Maru, Jap. str., for Yokohama.
 19, Hongkong M., Jap. str., for San Francisco.
 19, Kjeld, Norwegian str., for Tsingtau.
 19, Ku sang, British str., for Singapore.
 19, Kwangtah, Chinese str., for Shanghai.
 19, Luohow, British str., for Shanghai.
 19, Macduff, British str., for Moji.
 19, Minnesota, American str., for Shanghai.
 19, Nijni Norgorod, Rus. str., for Singapore.
 19, Oceana, British str., for Europe, &c.
 19, Phranang, German str., for Bangkok.
 19, P. Waldemar, Ger. str., for Yokohama.
 19, Shinno Maru, Japanese str., for Saigon.
 19, Ulv, Norwegian str., for Saigon.
 19, Zafiro, British str., for Manila.

- 20, Amigo, German str., for Hoihow.
 20, Belgravia, German str., for Haiphong.
 20, Chihli, British str., for Hoihow.
 20, Dakotah, British str., for Palembang.
 20, Foochow, British str., for Shanghai.
 20, Joshin Maru, Japanese str., for Swatow.
 20, Kinkiang, British str., for Ningpo.
 20, Kweiyang, British str., for Chefoo.
 20, Sithonia, German str., for Shanghai.
 20, Spir, Norwegian str., for Saigon.
 20, Tsurugisan M., Jap. str., for Kuchinotzu.
 21, Orwell, British str., for Manila.
 22, Atholl, British str., for Shanghai.
 22, Benlomond, British str., for Nagasaki.
 22, Dagmar, Norwegian str., for Bangkok.
 22, Fukura Maru, Japanese str., for Moji.
 22, Haiching, British str., for Swatow.
 22, Hild, Norwegian str., for Bangkok.
 22, Hupeh, British str., for K. C. Wan.
 22, Rajaburi, German str., for Swatow.
 22, Taming, British str., for Manila.
 22, Tjikini, Dutch str., for Batavia.
 23, Chipshing, British str., for Swatow.
 23, Chiyuen, Chinese str., for Shanghai.
 23, Deucalion, British str., for Singapore.
 23, Frithjof, Norwegian str., for Swatow.
 23, Hailan, French str., for Hoihow.
 23, Hanoi, French str., for Haiphong.
 23, Kleist, German str., for Europe, &c.
 23, Orland, Norwegian str., for Singapore.
 23, Pongtong, German str., for Bangkok.
 23, Zweena, British str., for Sonrabaya.
 24, F. of India, Brit. str., for Vancouver.
 24, Hue, French str., for Kwang Chow Wan.
 24, Huichow, British str., for Swatow.
 24, J. Diederichsen, Ger. str., for Hoihow.
 24, Kumsang, British str., for Singapore.
 24, Manila, British str., for Singapore.
 24, Palembang, Dutch str., for Palembang.
 24, Stettin, British str., for Tientsin.

PASSENGERS.

ARRIVED.

- Per *Empire*, from Kobe, Miss McFarlane and Mr. E. P. Lloyd.
 Per *Japan*, from Calcutta, &c., Major M. E. Willoughby, Mrs. E. S. Levy and two children, Miss Joshua, Dr. D. R. Paul, Inspector Conlan, Comdr. and Mrs. P. Conner and child, and Mr. J. R. Saklat.
 Per *Montague* for Hongkong, from Vancouver, Mr. Mrs. and Miss Caurarch, Misses F. Leavis and Karen Jensen, & Mr. Chas. Waure; from Yokohama, Capt. T. Gray; from Shanghai, Mr. and Mrs. H. G. White, Mr. and Mrs. Payne, and Mr. T. R. Reilly.
 Per *Empress of Japan*, for Hongkong, from Vancouver, H. E. The Governor of U. Borneo and Mrs. Gueritz, Mr. and Mrs. H. H. Horsey, Mr. and Mrs. H. E. Pollock, Mr. and Master Jack, Mrs. W. Turner, Mrs. Stokes and maid, Misses Samson, J. and L. Jack, Dr. A. M. Saluby, Dr. J. Yomell, Lieut. Whyte, R. A. Messrs. F. A. Viell, J. W. Pette, E. E. Wing, H. H. Gomjertz, Morton Smith, R. E. Humphreys and W. Broadway; from Yokohama, Mr. and Mrs. M. W. Slade, 3 children and nurse, Messrs. H. A. Jeffries and A. Nalivon; from Kobe, Mr. Mrs. and Miss Woodhouse, Mr. and Mrs. Hedbu, Major and Mrs. Duer, Mrs. Craddock, child and nurse; from Shanghai, Mrs. K. H. Jones, Messrs. J. Zaddley and Parker Ness and family.
 Per *Korea*, from San Francisco via Ports, Mr. and Mrs. L. Asen and child, Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Samuels, Mr. and Mrs. T. O. Rinker, Mr. and Mrs. A. Hocking and daughter, Rev. and Mrs. Leslie Wolfe and child, Mrs. Lua Takfan and servant, Mrs. C. N. Thorpe, Mrs. W. J. Dutton, Mrs. Emily Meiklejohn, Mrs. Frohman, Mrs. Margaret McPherson, Mrs. Alice S. Blount, Mrs. J. F. Case, Mrs. S. Davenport, Mrs. M. A. Huntington, Mrs. M. E. McClintock, Mrs. Margaret R. Melrose, Mrs. Lida C. Rogers, Misses V. E. B. Baugh, M. Thorpe, Duffin, Ethel Meiklejohn, Margaret Brown, Inez Logan, Marian Buntington, Mary W. Lawrence, Anna G. Major, Mae E. H. Teabody, Florence Rogers, W. Hocking, F. M. Hoffman, Mabel Wilcox and Elsie Wilcox, Rev. N. Merino, Rev. H. Greise, Messrs. S. Atami, B. Lichtig, A. Y. Comstock, J. Jose, N. D. Tata, H. F. Arthur, Fred Samuels, H. H. Patterson, W. D. Patterson, A. N. Clothier, A. H. Bardy, S. H. Barlow, Archibald Case, Frank P. McMahon, Samuel J. Miller, Wm. M. Smith, A. H. Williams, E. Hoffman, Geo. N. Wilcox and H. N. Whitford.

Per *Kleist*, for Hongkong, from Yokohama, Mrs. Inspector Krebs, Mrs. J. Green, Capt. W. Reher, Messrs. Robt. Landtmeters, Juan Hans, A. C. Holborow, B. A. Green, A. K. Springle, L. C. T. Balz and P. Kameseck; from Kobe, Messrs. C. A. Mackenzie, A. C. Phillips, J. Kadokawa, K. Deguki, J. Shibe and S. Magi; from Nagasaki, Mrs. Jimao Tsurkura, Miss Hazashida, and Mr. Tsun Takawashi; from Shanghai, Mr. and Mrs. Ch. T. Thwing, Prof. and Mrs. D. E. Smith, Mr. and Mrs. Quaz and servant, Mrs. Williams, Misses B. Schuler and Phillips, Messrs. J. R. L. Caldeo, C. S. Taylor, T. G. Schweder, M. Tamburg, Mangsinnham, Hewis Hefti, M. Rosenstock, W. Burchard, Alois Moisl, W. H. Stevenson and family, L. A. P. Franco, Nicholson, D. K. Kwon, C. Thomson, Thompson, Lawenberg and family, Fartin, Gomez and Kralewitsch; for Singapore, from Yokohama, Messrs. H. Ahmat, W. E. Wheeler and family; from Nagasaki, Mrs. C. Arimori, and Miss Shima Tsushita; from Shanghai, Mr. A. G. Israel; for Colombo, from Kobe, Mr. and Mrs. C. Steenburg, Messrs. Burton Tate and H. T. Wallace; for Penang, from Shanghai, Mr. D. W. Yange; from Yokohama, for London, Mr. and Mrs. Coutts, Mrs. H. C. Litchfield, Miss Tripp, Messrs. J. Gadsby, G. O. Adams, Henry and C. Louthier; from Kobe, for Port Said, Mr. Binzaker; from Nagasaki, for Nipol, Guide Dr. Del Lutte, Messrs. P. Gismondo and J. Biago; for Genoa, Capt. G. Massa, and Mr. T. C. Mischretto; for Bremen, Mr. Koch; from Shanghai, for London, Miss Turner, Messrs. W. W. Howell, H. E. Rigge, H. McDade, Th. Jos. Ryan and G. H. Hiwkes; for Genoa, Misses A. Brown and A. Robinson, Messrs. Carl Albers, H. T. Tompkins, Scharffe, Donath, Steinert and Behrens; for Bremen, Rev. A. E. Andre, Messrs. V. S. Bryngulfsen, A. Ludwig, A. Schopf and H. Franz.

DEPARTED.

Per *Empress of India*, from Hongkong, for Vancouver, &c., Mr. and Mrs. Weigand, Mr. and Mrs. Baggard and child, Mr. and Mrs. Beattie, Mr. and Mrs. Grant Squires, Mrs. Blount, Mrs. Toulon, Misses Roeber and Peabody, Major Gen. Broadwood, Madame Ohana, Messrs. Baul, Gausin, Marshall, Watanabe, A. J. Hosken, Geo. P. Lammert, Ford, H. G. Simms, Barber, F. McHugh, Calder and O. Sech.
 Per *Minnesota*, from Hongkong, for Seattle, &c., Mr. and Mrs. Fisher, Mrs. J. N. Weaver, Mrs. L. D. Weeks, Mrs. Eck-berger, Miss Watson, Rev. R. C. Thomas, Father John Garais, Hon. E. Osborne and servant, Lieut. N. M. Green, U.S. Army, Monsieur Raynaud, Messrs. C. H. Loeb, Irvin V. Todd, M. M. Smith, P. M. Corwine, N. S. Brown, F. Adams, B. W. Tape, Fresise, A. Fisher, Agapito de Longa and H. E. Wait and servant.
 Per *Hongkong Maru*, from Hongkong, for San Francisco, &c., Mr. and Mrs. Geo. Horridge, Col. and Mrs. A. Williams, Mrs. and Miss Hanaway, Mrs. B. A. Harnett, Mrs. M. McComber, Mrs. E. A. Billings, Mrs. E. J. Huggins, Misses H. E. Huggins, R. C. Davis, M. R. and R. D. Williams, Master Harnett, Messrs. Phya Vorady, Nai Patch, M. S. Silverstone, Timothy Moe, E. Heintz, H. Gentert, W. J. D. Young, W. Baum, B. D. Mulligan, J. H. Shipley and A. C. Hanland.
 Per *Kleist*, from Hongkong, for Bremen, &c., His Excellency Governor E. P. Gueritz and Mrs. Gemablin, Mr. and Mrs. Rod A. E. Andre, Mr. and Mrs. Coutts and children, Mr. and Mrs. C. Steenburg, Rev. and Mrs. O. F. Wisner and son, Mrs. Foovey, Mrs. Jones, Mrs. H. C. Lichtfield, Mrs. Moses, Mrs. Prof. Selenka, Misses d'Aquino, Brent, A. Brown, A. Robinson, M. de Stoppehaar, Tripp and Turner, Dr. R. Th. Haasmann, Dr. Guido Del Lu ta, Dr. E. B. Mercant, Capt. Guglielmo Massa, Major Millis, Lieut. Carlo Mischrette, Messrs. H. Ahmat, Carl Albers, G. O. Adams, Arbenz, M. Benzaker, Berry, Donath, H. M. Dada, J. Gadsby, Pietro Gismondo, W. W. Howell Kar, Hume, Haleboos, Haleboos, jr., A. G. Israel, C. Ingenohl, D. W. Jonge, J. H. de Kempenaar, R. C. Lind-boom, Henry C. Louthier, Loewner, J. Meyer, F. Oppenhort, Poblott, H. E. Rigge, J. Reumar, Reiss, Scharffe, Steinert, P. A. van de Stadt, L. R. Somers, A. de Stoppehaar, Horace T. Tomplains, Burton Tate, T. Tietgens, H. E. Wallace and W. E. Wheeler and family.
 Printed and published by BERTRAM ARGUSTUS HALL, for the Concerned, at 10A, Des Voeux Road Central, City of Victoria, Hongkong. London Office 131, Fleet Street, E.C.